

ENCYCLOPAEDIA
OF
**GROUP
DISCUSSIONS**
FOR
SERVICES SELECTION BOARD INTERVIEWS
& FOR
UNIVERSITY & COMPETITIVE
EXAMINATIONS
(**VOLUME I**)

by
Prof. T.K. Dutt, M A. (Cal. & Dac.)
Former, Senator of Agra University.

Published by :
Students' Academic Council,
1882, BALDEV NAGAR,
AMBALA CITY (Haryana)

Published by :
JASWANT SINGH,
Secretary,
Student's Academic Council,
1882, Baldev Nagar, Ambala City (Haryana)

All Rights Reserved

Price . **Rs. TWENTY-FIVE only**

Printed by :
V. Jain at Lalima Printers,
Ambala Cantt.

P R E F A C E

This book is primarily intended for those, who appear at the Services Selection Board for interview, seeking a Commission in the Armed Forces. It is next intended for University students and Central Services Competitive Examination candidates, who have to appear before the Public Service Commission for interview, which is known as the *Viva Voce* test and to which is allotted atleast 200 marks. The book is intended for University students because they often have to take part in debates — either inter-collegiate or inter-university debates. These debates are really very important, not merely because of the laurels which are awarded to the best speakers or debators but also because they prepare them for a much harder contest particularly when they are ambitious of becoming good lawyers or good parliamentarians. Man actually rules the world by either the art of speech or by the skill of the sword. This book has laid bare all the secrets of the art of speech on which is founded the art of debate or the art of discussion; it has shown the practical steps which are followed by a good debator or a speaker. Hence, students or candidates for Services Selection Board interviews should carefully read the Introduction as well as mark the chain of arguments developed in the various discussions.

This book can also be treated as a book of essays, because each discussion forms by itself an independent essay. The topics of the discussions in this book are current topics, and

as such they are quite important and can be easily expected at any of the University or Services Competitive Examinations. We can assure our readers that we have done our best in this book, and we shall feel our labour amply rewarded if the book is found useful by those for whom it is intended.

T.K DUTT.

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Introduction—The Art of Discussion	1
Group Discussions	
1. Is India justified in remaining within the Commonwealth of Nations ?	9
2. Is the U N O. a success or a failure ?	24
3. Is Co-education a curse or a blessing ?	33
4. Is Child-marriage better or worse than adult marriage ?	42
5. Which of the evils would you choose—gambling or drinking ?	50
6. Should Cinema be banned to students ?	59
7. Would you prefer country life or town life And why ?	68
8. Do you think, Anglo-Indian schools turn out better students than Indian Schools ?	78
9. Should Prohibition be enforced by legislation or not ?	86
10. Can Armament stop War ?	95
Should the diseased and the crippled be allowed to live or not ?	106
12. Who is the better man—a soldier or a hangman ?	114
13. Should students be admitted to institutions in order of merit ?	121
14. Should capital punishment be abolished or not ?	132
15. Who is more serviceable to Society—a teacher or a doctor or a soldier or a priest ?	14

	Page
16. Should military training be compulsory ?	... 152
17. Is beauty most adorned when unadorned ?	... 159
18. How far is the policy of Non-alignment practicable in the modern world ?	... 167
19. Do you think, non-violence is practicable in any sphere of human affairs ?	... 178
20. Who is the best guide in life—the teacher, the parent or the friend ?	187
21. Is Science a blessing or a Curse ?	193
22. Is the Examination System a true test of merit ?	. 204
23. Which would you prefer and why—love marriage or arranged marriage ?	. 211
24. Which is the secret weapon of a soldier—brain or arms or self-confidence ?	.. 222
25. Should we be vegetarians or meat-eaters ?	.. 229
26. Is Science at war with Religion ?	... 238
27. Should we keep on English as an associate language in India or not ?	.. 246
28. Which plays the more important role in human life—pluck or luck ?	.. 258
29. Would you prefer hostel or home life ? How would you justify your preference ?	... 267
30. Which will win the race—Democracy or Communism ?	... 277
31. Is a Graduate wife a blessing or a curse ?	. 289
32. Is Divorce a blessing or a curse ?	... 296
33. The Bible says, “Increase and multiply”. Would you or not recommend family-planning against this Commandment ?	... 305

	Page
34. Should Beggars and Sadhus be encouraged ?	... 311
35. Is a pretty wife a blessing or a curse ?	... 318
36. Is national integration possible in India ?	... 326
37. Should we be atheists or sceptists or nihilists ?	... 334
38. Should man or woman rule ?	... 343
39. Do you think, the East and the West shall never meet ?	... 350
40. Should we legalise abortion or not ?	... 359
41. Should we impart sex education to Children or not ?	... 366
42. Is poverty a blessing or a curse ?	... 373
43. Who is the bigger fool—the husband or the wife ?	... 381
44. Is Politics the last refuge of a scoundrel ?	... 387
45. Is plain living and high thinking the best maxim of life ?	... 393
46. Which would you prefer—Machine or Man, and why ?	... 401
47. Which would you prefer and why?—monogamy, polygamy or polyandry ?	... 410
48. Who is wiser—age or youth ?	... 419
49. Which dress should we follow—Indian or English ? And why ?	... 427
50. Should general education be altogether scrapped ?	... 435

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

For

S.S.B. Interviews,
Competitive Examinations,
College and University Debates,
and
Various Professions

Introduction

THE ART OF DISCUSSION

Distinction between Speech and Discussion

A speech is made and conducted by a single individual, while a discussion or debate is conducted by several persons. A speech may take fifteen minutes to one hour or more. But each speaker in a discussion or a debate should not take more than five minutes. A discussion or a debate can be conducted for more than an hour ; but a speech becomes boring if it is conducted for more than an hour.

A speech is not necessarily argumentative although it contains various elements—arguments, facts and figures, anecdotes or short stories, descriptions, humorous touches, appeal to reason as well as to emotion. If a speech is exclusively argumentative, it does not appeal very much to the common listeners because argumentation means reasoning which can not

affect very much the illiterate or the ignorant listeners. It is only emotional speeches which appeal to such masses. In Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* we find how the speech of Brutus fails to have any effect upon the Roman mob, while we find how the speech of Antony maddens the mob. It is simply because the speech of Brutus is too learned and abstract while the speech of Antony is perfectly common, natural and emotional.

In the case of a discussion or a debate, each of the speakers or participants depends entirely upon arguments and reason without which he can not win his position or the side of a proposition he takes up in the discussion or debate which is the chief aim of such a verbal contest. In a discussion or a debate there is very little room for any emotional appeal, any description or story-telling because everything has got to be to the point, because there is no room for round-about ways.

Utility of the art of speech and discussion

It is not only in the Services Selection Board and the Public Service Commission for competitive examinations but also in colleges and universities as well as in the various trades and professions, the art of speech and discussion is most useful. In Colleges and universities you have to make individual speeches under the auspices of the Union or on other ceremonial occasions you have to deliver speeches as well as take part in debates or discussions to win certain laurels either for yourself or for your group. In competitive examinations two hundred or three hundred marks are allotted to the *viva voce* test or interviews before the Public Service Commissions, and you are put all sorts of questions and problems which you have to answer with facts and figures and arguments and which finally decide your fate in the hands of the Selection or the Interviewing Board. Then again, in all recruitments to a Commission in the Armed Forces (Army, Navy and Air Force) you have to appear before the Group Testing Officer who puts up before a group of the candidates for a commission any interesting, intelligent and controversial problem for each one of you to take up one by one and to defend or oppose the proposition with arguments and facts and figures on the very spot. This meeting is called a group-discussion meeting, and it is intended

to bring out your intelligence, your readiness of mind, your argumentative power, your power of expression, your demeanour and so many other qualities which are requisite for being an officer in the Armed Forces. Otherwise too, you have to appear before many other officers of the Armed Forces such as the Secretary, the Psychiatrist, the Psychologist, the Deputy President and the President in order to show to them that you possess following qualities :—

1. Team spirit. 2. Courage. 3. Discipline. 4. Loyalty. 5. Power of Control or Command. 6. Truthfulness. 7. Sense of duty. 8. Determination. 9. Endurance. 10. Sense of honour. 11. Sense of justice. 12. Spirit of adventure. 13. Punctuality. 14. Impartiality. 15. Perseverance. 16. Selflessness etc. etc.

You will have to submit yourself to all sorts of tests for four days such as Physical test ; Personality test ; Psychology test ; Intelligence test ; Picture-story test ; Group Discussion test etc. etc. before you can be selected for a commission in the Armed Forces.

It is not only in the Services competitive examinations but also in some of the trades and professions you are required to master the art of speech and discussion ; otherwise you will not be successful either as a salesman or as a lawyer. Of all other professions, the legal profession requires most the mastery of the art of discussion because a lawyer while defending his client has to put forward all sorts of arguments, and facts and figures also, before the judge in order to get his client acquitted from the penalties of law whether he is perfectly innocent or completely guilty. So many thieves, robbers, swindlers, forgerers, and even murderers have got scott-free from the clutches by the arguments put forward by their defending lawyers. A lawyer may be most well-versed in the codes of law but if he can not argue a case with all the brilliance of his tongue, the readiness of his mind and the most irrefutable chain of arguments, he can never impress the judge or win his case, and naturally, he can not set up any roaring practice of his trade or profession.

In the same way, if a business salesman does not have much of acquaintance with the secrets of the art of discussion or the art of representation of any industrial or commercial commodity, he can never succeed as a salesman, or rather he can not secure any satisfactory business on behalf of his company. Both the lawyer and the salesman should have considerable mastery over his expression, should have a remarkable readiness of mind, and should have also in stock all sorts of valid arguments in order to push the sale of his ware before the purchaser or the customer. The arguments of a lawyer or a salesman should not be necessarily based on truth, but on the other hand, they are mostly based on falsehood because a lawyer has to prove a guilty man innocent while a salesman has to prove a spurious article or commodity as genuine and of a high order.

Secrets of the art of speech

Although the art of speech is more or less a natural gift yet it can be acquired to a great extent by a long practice or discipline of the tongue and the mind. The ancient world used to know the sword as the greatest weapon ; but now-a-days, people know the pen to be mightier than the sword and the tongue to be still mightier than the pen. While practising the art of speech you have got to do the following things :—

1. To increase your vocabulary or stock of words.
2. To get over your shyness and nervousness.
3. To cultivate a good gait or demeanour or deportment.
4. To practise some graceful or dramatic gestures *i.e.* movements of your limbs.
5. To cultivate the readiness of your mind.
6. To develop some amount of argumentative skill.
7. To quote the well-known sayings, proverbs and the words of the great men.
8. To cultivate a humorous tongue.

9. To be able to quote facts and figures, verses and chapters if and when the occasion would demand.

10. To develop some amount of the superiority complex over the listeners.

11. To know the Psychology of your audience.

12. To develop the habit of story-telling if and when the occasion would demand.

13. To be absolutely stage-free *i.e.* completely detached from the audience.

14. To prepare your speech before hand by noting down certain important points on a particular subject.

15. To read books of various subjects of art and science in order to increase the stock of words.

16. To read the well-known speeches of the great orators, speakers of the world such as of Edmund Burke, Winston Churchill, Sir Surendra Nath Banerjee, Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal, Dr. S Radhakrishnan, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu etc.

17. To practise gait, gestures, behaviour of movement of the limbs before a chival or full-size mirror.

18. To cultivate a good voice by shouting and singing.

19. To cultivate good pronunciation, correct accentuation etc. because pronunciation and voice carry a good deal with the audience.

20. To practise clear thinking, appropriate use of words, brevity of expression.

Secrets of the Art of Discussion

You have to practise the following over and above what has been advised for the art of speech. The two arts are practically the same, because both require considerable power of expression which can be acquired only by a long practice. Both the art of speech and the art of discussion being an art

depend for their success upon regular practice. You can not learn swimming or bicycling or even type-writing or horse-riding or fencing or boxing in a day. Ofcourse, you have got to learn also the science part of both the arts ; and what are science parts ? Correct pronunciation, proper accentuation, appropriate use of words, use of syllogistic reasoning *i.e.* no irrelevant argument ; clear and systematic thinking. Arguments must be sound and supported by facts and figures. Politeness of language ; no unpleasant comments ; no ironical or sarcastic remarks should be made against opponents in a discussion. Expressions should be simple, concise and precise ; arguments should be always relevant and to the point without which you will miss the mark or lose your position while defending or opposing any particular proposition.

You must not repeat thoughts or indulge in too many quotations. Be neither too loud nor too soft or faint, because shouting betrays nervousness or overdoing one's part and naturally has an adverse effect upon the audience. If you are too faint or soft in your voice, you will become inaudible, and hence, it will be as good as talking to yourself. You should never be in a hurry ; but on the other hand, you should utter your words slowly, clearly and emphatically so that your listeners may be convinced of what you are saying. Never beat about the bush but come straight to the point. Never be abusive however much you may be opposed to certain views or opinion or ideas. Any expression of bad temper is interpreted by an intelligent audience as a weakness. Always advance practical suggestions, irrefutable arguments, and also quote authentic facts and figures. Do not make any ugly gesture of your body *e.g.* scratching your head ; leaning over the desk ; playing with your chin or monstache ; making any forward or backward movement of your body ; twisting any of your fingers or frequently blowing the nose ; do not stop abruptly while speaking or arguing on a particular subject ; do not use any of the mannerisms in the use of words such as "the point is" ; "do you understand ?" ; "just see" ; "as a matter of fact" ; "do you see ?" ; "for God's sake" ; etc.

In order to master the art of discussion, you should follow the Socratic method or the dilectical method *i.e.* the method of

putting questions to oneself and also answering them oneself. Socrates used to put up one proposition first, and then used to build up questions on that proposition by which he used to harass, puzzle, confuse and ultimately corner his opponents in such a manner that they were bound to be convinced of his view-point or position, whether the view-point was right or not. That is why, the Socratic method or the dialectical method has been branded by certain logicians as a sophistical method. Most of the successful lawyers, debators or participants in discussions adopt this kind of method, and whether their arguments are based on facts or not, they win their case in the teeth of opposition by blocking all the loopholes of escape to the opponents. Most of the lawyers, the salesmen and the debators do not always deal with truth but they deal mostly with falsehood. But then, a group discussion before a Services Selection Board or rather before the Group Testing Officer or Officers, you should not be sophistical or dialectical like Socrates, you should not play upon words in order to confuse your opponents. but on the other hand, you should always deal with truths and state actual facts because facts are really stranger than fiction and are far more convincing than any brilliantly coloured falsehood, and truths are far more honourable and entertaining than heavily-spiced lies or untruths ; and besides, in the Armed Forces Services as well as in the Civil Services Competitions, much importance is attached to truthfulness, integrity, honesty, sincerity, and other virtues of human character, because in the opinion of the civil or military appointing authorities, integrity of character is the most essential quality of an officer.

In a Group Discussion of the Armed Forces Services Selection Board, a group of six or seven candidates is allotted for discussion to be completed within half an hour in the presence of two Group Testing Officers. The Group Testing Officers do not ask any of the candidates to open the discussion on the proposition allotted to them, but it is the duty of any of the candidates to take the lead and open the debate ; and then, the discussion is carried on by the other five or six candidates ; each candidate is allowed to speak for three or four minutes either defending or opposing a proposition. A few candidates

do not speak at all because of their shyness or because they offer any arguments either for or against the proposition ; and such candidates naturally are disqualified ; and besides any candidate who talks irrelevant things, who does not give logical arguments, who break down in the course of the discussion due to shyness or nervousness who make their voice either inaudible or unduly loud, who do not observe politeness in their expression, who talk at random or beat about the bush are equally disqualified You should remember that while taking part in a group discussion you are constantly under observation of the Group Testing Officers who watch not only your words and arguments, gait and behaviour but who also analyse the psychology of your mind in order to find out how far you are capable of being an officer, a leader, a commander under any unexpected situation, how far you have been able to develop the following qualities which are necessary for being an officer (Commissioned Officer) in the Armed Forces : Keenness and depth, foresight and insight, readiness and alertness of the mind ; consistency of thought and power of reasoning ; courage ; tolerance ; aspiration ; balance ; initiative ; wit and humour ; compassion etc.

Discussion No. 1

IS INDIA JUSTIFIED IN REMAINING WITHIN THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, India is perfectly justified to remain in the Commonwealth of Nations for the following reasons :—

1. India has recently attained her political independence and would require some time to put herself on her own legs, to carry out her development programmes and to adjust her economy

2. The Commonwealth of Nations would be a great support to India in times of peace as well as of war.

3. India would be able to build up her foreign relations through the Commonwealth of Nations.

4. It is always safer and more profitable to be a satellite to a big planet or a heavenly body till one becomes an independent body like the sun or the stars.

5. India believes in Democracy, and the Commonwealth of Nations is a big democratic institution.

6. India is not prepared to align herself with Capitalism or Communism particularly when she has been exploited by Britain, one of the biggest capitalist countries in the world, for nearly two centuries.

7. Being a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, does not mean any political or military alliance with it.

8. The world is split up between Democracy and Communism, and India must vote for Democracy; otherwise she will have to suffer like China.

9. India needs financial and technical (scientific) aids from the progressive countries.

10. India needs also supplies of food from time to time because India suffers from frequent droughts.

11. India has two treacherous neighbours—Pakistan and China—that have already made two unprovoked aggressions upon her.

12. India will rise by union and will fall by division.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, the arguments which have been put forward by our honourable friend in favour of the proposition are not tenable for the following reasons :—

1. Indian will never learn to stand on her own legs if she always depends upon other nations just as a child can never learn walking if he does not fall down or stumble, if he is always supported by some human hand or some artificial prop or stilt or crutch. We should know that self-help is the best help; and it is by self-help or rather by self-exertion that one can learn to perform something. How can India ever learn to develop herself if she always depends upon other countries for any kind of guidance? India was under British rule for two centuries but did India develop herself any way during that long period? How can she, therefore, expect to develop herself in future when the Commonwealth of Nations means the rule of Britain or of Britain's satellites?

2. Did the Commonwealth of Nations help India when she was attacked by Pakistan and China? On the other hand, did not Britain incite Pakistan to attack Kashmir and Jammu? Did not Britain and her confederate U. S. A. supply huge

amounts of arms and ammunition to Pakistan which they said that Pakistan should use against China if China attacked Pakistan. But did Pakistan use the arms and ammunition against China or against India? Did not Pakistan make an open or secret collusion with China? Did not Pakistan give away a good portion of Kashmir (which Pakistan held illegally) to China? Did Britain ever object to this stolen gift or to the use of arms and ammunition against India which she had supplied to Pakistan? And, therefore, how can our honourable friend say that the Commonwealth of Nations would be a great support to India in times of peace as well as of war?

3. I am afraid, gentlemen, India instead of building up her foreign relations through the Commonwealth of Nations has lost many of them because Britain's policy has always been to hunt with the hound and run with the hair. India has now very few friendly nations because of her membership of the Commonwealth of Nations.

4. Our honourable friend says that it is always safer and more profitable to be a satellite to a big heavenly body; but, gentlemen, I should like to know if Britain is now-a-days at all a big heavenly body. In my humble opinion, Britain after the liquidation of her empire has become almost a non-entity; and that is why, she has now become a satellite to U.S.A. Should India then become a satellite to a satellite? (Laughter)

5. My honourable friend says that India believes in democracy. I have no objection. But how can he say that the Commonwealth of Nations is a big democratic institution? If it were really so, why should Britain still try to suppress, from behind the screen, some of the unliberated States in Africa and in South East Asia? Britain's democracy means nothing but neo-colonialism or neo-imperialism without owning any colony or empire (Laughter).

6. Our honourable friend admits very frankly that Britain is a capitalist country and that India has been exploited by Britain for nearly two centuries. How can India therefore, trust any more a capitalist and exploiting country like Britain?

If India wants to remain in the Commonwealth of Nations, how can she escape from the capitalistic and exploiting policies of Britain. Can our honourable friend explain this paradox ?

7. Pardon me, gentlemen, if I do not follow exactly when our honourable friend says that being a member of the Commonwealth of Nations does not mean any political or military alliance with it. What kind of alliance is that then ? Is it economic or social or technical (scientific) alliance. In my humble opinion, alliance is alliance

8. Gentlemen, our honourable friend has raised a fresh riddle before us, namely, that the world is split up between Democracy and Communism, and that India must vote for Democracy. We have already agreed that India will always vote for Democracy but if that Democracy is Capitalist Democracy, as Britain undoubtedly is, why should we not vote for Communism particularly when India has already suffered so much in the hands of Capitalism and has become one of the most crippled and impoverished countries in the world ? With due respect to our honourable friend I beg to differ from the view that India will suffer like China if she joins the communist camp. I should like to point out to you all, gentlemen, that China is the cause of her own ruin ; it is not Communism, which is responsible for the revolt in China these days, but, on the other hand, it is Maoism (dictatorship of Mao Tse-tung) which is solely responsible for the present chaos in China. I do not believe that India can ever lead to that chaos whether she joins Communism or remains in Democracy.

9. I do not deny that India needs for her development financial and technical (scientific) aid from the progressive countries. But is Britain really one of the most generous countries in the world that she has opened an alms-house for all undeveloped countries—India or Africa ? I am afraid, Britain is too poor to land any financial aid to India. Have we forgotten the year 1949 when we had to devalue the Rupee to save the British Pound ? Are we not suffering most bitterly due to our devaluation of the Rupee over again ? Is not our suffering due again to our saving of the British pound ?

10. India may need supplies of food from time to time because of her frequent droughts. But is it really honourable for any country to go out every year with the begging bowl? Why should not India develop her own agriculture particularly when she has in her possession unlimited areas of cultivable lands, and also when her teeming millions are hungry for food as much as for work? So, food shortage should never be an argument for remaining in the Commonwealth of Nations. Then again, Britain never supplied food to India; it is Canada and Australia and U.S.A. who supplied food every year to us. Can we not get such supplies even if India ceases to be a member of the Commonwealth of Nations?

11. Our honourable friend has said that our two most treacherous neighbours are Pakistan and China, and therefore, if we want to be saved any further aggression from them, we shall have to remain in the Commonwealth of Nations. Does our friend mean to say that we should depend upon other nations for our self protection? In my humble opinion if a nation can not defend herself, it is better for her to die. Why should we not be able to protect ourselves from Pakistan which is hardly one-fifth of India in size and strength? It is scandalous to think of seeking protection from any other nation in order to guard against Pakistan which is just like a mouse when compared with India which is as big and strong as an elephant. As for China, our population is almost equal to China's population, and in military strength, we are in no way inferior to China; and therefore, why should we be afraid of China however barbarous and aggressive she may be towards us?

12. I am sorry, I do not seem to follow what my honourable friend actually means when he says that India will rise by union and fall by division. Every nation falls and rises like that. But what our rise and fall has to do with our membership of the Commonwealth of Nations?

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I beg to differ from my immediately preceding speaker on the following points :—

1. Self-help is undoubtedly the best help; but then, every one has to depend on others for sometime atleast in order to be perfectly independent. Can a child learn speaking or walking or swimming or doing anything without the help of others atleast for some time? Can any body learn anything,— language or art or science or any branch of knowledge without being under some tutor for some time? Therefore, India also needs for some years some kind of help or support from other nations whether it is Britain or Russia or U S A. or any other country. Hence, is it not advisable that so long India can not develop her science and industries, so long she can not build up her economy, she should better remain in the Commonwealth of Nations in order to take advantage of their resources and opportunities. When Britain has been the pioneer in the field of science and industries, why should we deprive ourselves of Britain's services or the services of Canada, Australia and other member countries of the Commonwealth of Nations? India might have been exploited by Britain in the past but India was then a subject country; but now that she is an independent country, how can she be exploited by Britain unless she herself plays the fool?

2. My previous speaker does not seem to know the real facts about the supply of arms and ammunition by Britain and U.S.A. to Pakistan; and besides, he has totally forgotten how previous to Chinese and Pakistani aggression India too had been supplied plenty of arms and ammunition by both U.S.A. and Britain. The only difference may be that Pakistan having had no other arms and ammunition was compelled to use the supplies from Britain and U S A. against us while we having had plenty of our own war material used it in our defence against Pakistani aggression

3. It is no fault of the Commonwealth of Nations or even of the United Nations that India has lost many of her friends. India has been following the policy of Non-alignment which has been much misunderstood and misinterpreted abroad, and this kind of foreign policy is the chief cause of the loss of many of our friends in the political world. And besides, India

has been always most imprudent to express her views and opinions on certain matters of international politics which have led many of our friendly countries believe that India has been following the policy of opportunism—the policy of hunting with the hound and running with the hair !

4. Gentlemen, I do not believe, as my honourable previous speaker says, that Britain is a mere satellite to U.S.A. I do not believe that Britain has become a non-entity although she has lost India and many of her colonies. I do not believe that India will be a mere satellite to a satellite if she remains in the Commonwealth of Nations. On the other hand, India may grow much stronger and also brighter by her association with Britain as U.S.A. has grown by being guided by Britain in all international affairs. If such a powerful and prosperous country as U.S.A. can feel proud of her association with Britain, why should not India also feel equally proud of her membership of the Commonwealth of Nations of which Britain is the guiding spirit

5. It is quite true, as the Honourable previous speaker says, that India believes in democracy. Britain too is the most democratic country in the world. How can she lose her democratic spirit even if she happens to be an imperialist or a colonialist at the same time ? Is not Russia democratic and at the same time Communist ? Do you think, gentlemen, that India is also communist simply because she is friendly to Russia ? I am sure, India will not be an imperialist or a colonialist by merely being a member of the Commonwealth of Nations.

6. There is absolutely no paradox in India's remaining in the Commonwealth of Nations knowing full well that Britain, who is the leading member of the Commonwealth, is a capitalist and exploiting country, because every progressive and industrialised country now-a-days happens to be a capitalist and exploiting country. Even Russia, who claims to be a Communist country, and as such, who is a dead enemy to capitalism and exploitation, is also exploiting her labourers (the working class) in the offices, factories, mills, workshops, and in the cornfields as much as any other highly industrialised country is doing.

7. What is the harm, gentlemen, if India is in alliance with Britain by being a member of the Commonwealth of Nations? In moments of dire need or a crisis (such as war), no neutrality, no non-alignment can be observed or pre-erred. Every country has to live up with some country or other, near or distant, big or small whichever would be helpful to meet the crisis. As a matter of fact India in spite of her open declaration of the policy of non-alignment has been constantly aligning herself with various powerful nations not only in times of war but also in times of peace. Did not India seek help from U.S.A., Britain, Russia when she was attacked by China in 1962? Has not India been constantly seeking food supplies, financial and technical (scientific) aids from U.S.A., Britain, Germany, Russia, Yugoslavia, France and many other countries ever since she became politically independent in 1947?

8. I do not seem to follow how my previous speaker raises the question of communism in the case of India, particularly, in connection with her membership of the Commonwealth of Nations. In my humble opinion, such a question is absolutely irrelevant, I am sure, India did not join the Commonwealth simply because it is a democratic or an anti-communist institution or federation, but because of certain other considerations. Does my honourable previous speaker mean to say that we have turned communist or anti-democratic simply because we have very intimate relations with Russia? India is not at all an impoverished country as my honourable friend alleges; but on the other hand, she is much richer than China and many other countries in the East or in the West. India was already rich in her material resources but after her Independence, she has grown richer by her great scientific and industrial developments. There is absolutely no comparison between China and India. China is a far more backward and barbarous country than India. China can be ruled by a misguided dictator like Mao Tse-tung but India has got her traditions of culture which China has not, and therefore, Communism can never flourish in the soil of India. China's militarism, her explosive population, her history of barbarism are her greatest handicaps while India has none of these handicaps; and therefore, it is not at all true, as my honourable

friend predicts that India will suffer like China if she joins the Communist camp.

9. My honourable friend is again sadly mistaken when he says that our devaluation of the Rupee was caused by the unsteady or unstable position of the British pound. Such monetary devaluation or evaluation has to occur sometimes whenever there is any inflation in a country ; and hence, India's membership of the Commonwealth of Nations has nothing to do with her economic stability or imbalance.

10. It is wrong to say, as well as it is insulting India's national prestige when my honourable friend says that India goes out every year with the begging bowl in order to procure food supplies from various countries. India does not beg or borrow but purchases food supplies from various countries, not from Britain alone, and hence, my honourable friend is not justified in making a false allegation against his own motherland. India should certainly develop her own agriculture but inspite of the development of agriculture, certain big countries, like Russia and China have to face sometimes a very acute form of food famine ; and hence, what is the special fault of India if she suffers occasionally from food famine due to drought or under-production or destruction by vermin and pestilence ?

11. My honourable friend has pointed out that it is scandalous for any country to seek protection from any another country when she is being attacked by a foreign aggressor. My honourable friend seems to forget history altogether. I should like to point out to him in this connection how during the last two World Wars, even the biggest and the most powerful countries sought help from other countries—big or small—in order to defeat their enemies and save themselves. Did not Britain invite U S A. to save her, or did not Germany invite Japan to help her, or did not Italy align herself with Germany in both the Wars, or did not Russia join hands once with Germany against Britain and France, while another time became allies to Britain and France against Germany ? My honourable friend should know that no country in the world can be so self-

sufficient or so powerful that she would never need any kind of help from any other country in times of peace or of war

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, in my honest opinion, India should never remain within the Commonwealth of Nations, and I would like to submit the following arguments in support of my contention :—

1. We have already declared before the world that we are going to follow the policy of non-alignment in our relations with all countries, and hence, even after that open declaration, we become a member of a particular group of nations, it would be going back upon our own word

2. Britain originally organised the “British” Commonwealth of Nations but later on changed its name into the “Commonwealth of Nations” on the suggestion of Pandit Nehru in order to form a power bloc and also to enhance her fallen prestige after the liquidation of her empire.

3. Britain has not been helpful at all to India, as one of the honourable speakers has pointed out, even at a crisis, and therefore, why should India merely play the vassal to Britain and humiliate herself in the eyes of other nations ?

4. Britain has been always sowing the seed of hatred between Pakistan and India ; and even while she was the ruler of India and when there was no question of partition of India, she used to follow the policy of “divide and rule” by actually inciting communal disturbances in our country. The Hindus and the Muslims lived together in India for more than four or five centuries as brothers or as children of the same soil, but it was Britain who injected into the brains of some of the Muslim leaders that Hindus and Muslims were two different nations, and hence, some kind of partition of India was necessary. Mr. Jinnah was a tool in the hands of Britain, and it was through him that Britain propagated the most mischievous two nation theory with the result that India had to be partitioned in 1947 on the communal basis. And since then, Britain has been fomenting the feelings of hatred between Pakistan and India.

Gentlemen, you are all perfectly aware how Britain, while quitting India, had declared all the Native States of India (more than six hundred States) as Paramount States or perfectly independent States, and thereby created so many live volcanos inside this great sub continent which would have been in a wild conflagration had not Sardar Patel tackled the most difficult problem with an iron hand and considerable diplomacy. Then again, who is keeping alive the dispute of Kashmir and Jammu between Pakistan and India ? It is Britain, and through Britain U.S.A. How can we, therefore, remain in the Commonwealth of Nations knowing all these facts and knowing also Britain's eternal policy of "divide and rule" ? America was never interested in world politics or even in European politics ; but now she is interested even in the domestic politics of every country, and why ? Britain is the answer ; it is Britain alone who has been dragging U.S.A. out of her iron cell, and has been constantly egging her to poke her nose into every country's domestic affairs ; and that is why, U.S.A. is now-a-days fishing in every troubled water !

5. During the last fifteen years, India gained nothing by her membership of the Commonwealth of Nations except in the form of hatred and enmity from Pakistan, two unprovoked aggressions from Pakistan, the loss of a part of Kashmir which has been illegally occupied by Pakistan, loss of friendship with some of the major and minor nations, economic imbalance due to the devaluation of the Rupee in 1949 and in 1966 and a set-back of her development programmes

6. On top of all, India's membership of the Commonwealth of Nations has directly or indirectly generated some kind of misunderstanding between India and U.S.A. because U.S.A. is the leader of the United Nations while Britain is the leader of the Commonwealth of Nations, and as such, these two organisations are bound to be rivals to be each other; and it is the misfortune of India that she is associated with both the international organisations.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I strongly support the views and arguments

of the first speaker who has voted for India's membership of the Commonwealth of Nations. I do not seem to follow why some of the speakers should make so many accusations against Britain and thereby persuade India to drop out from the membership of the Commonwealth of Nations. I would like to invite your attention to the following facts and figures and warn you against any kind of imaginary speculation because we Indians are by nature inclined more to fiction than to facts, to indulge more in imagination than in practical thinking :—

1. In the first instance, it is Britain who has actually educated India and made her politically self-conscious by her rule of two centuries. Without English education, could we ever love freedom, love science and industries ; could we ever develop the democratic spirit in us ? Surely not. We should not be ungrateful to Britain particularly because Britain quitted India of her own accord and left her to rule herself. Can we forget the days of British rule in India when there was so much of discipline in the administration and practically no corruption anywhere in the country, when the cost of living was so cheap or low, when there was no fear of any foreign invasion from China or from any other quarter, and when there was atleast some kind of justice everywhere.

2. It was not the Britishers who instigated the Hindus and the Muslims to fight with each other but it was we who picked up quarrels on the slightest pretext. What was that 'music before mosque' or that 'cow slaughter before temple' except our own prejudice or superstition due to which there used to be such 'bloody' Hindu-Muslim riots everywhere in India.

3. Britain never instigated Pakistan to occupy illegally any portion of Kashmir nor did she advise Pakistan openly or secretly to keep alive the Kashmir dispute for ever. So, how can we say that Britain has been always sowing the seed of hatred and enmity between Pakistan and India ?

4. Can you say that Canada, Australia, Britain, who are all members of the Commonwealth of Nations, did not help us with food, arms and ammunition, technical aid etc. in moments

of our need ? If we deny it, we must be very ungrateful creatures indeed !

5. Some of us have been blaming Britain too much without looking at our own faults. Gentlemen, don't you think, this is most unfair ? In my honest opinion, it is because of our association with the Commonwealth of Nations as well as with the United Nations that India has come into the lime-light ; and if Britain did not help us at every step in all international affairs, India would have still remained far into the background, and none of our Prime Ministers or Presidents would have attained such an international stature because not only India but China, Japan, Africa and all other countries of the East are considered by the Western world as most backward and barbarous countries.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, I seriously object to the mis-statements of facts on the part of the fifth speaker who seems to be either completely ignorant of history and of current affairs, or who seems to be unduly blinded by the false glamour or glory of the Western world, and particularly of Britain. It is because of the presence of such people that our country is going from bad to worse.

1. It is absolutely wrong on the part of the fifth speaker to say that Britain educated us, made us politically self-conscious or made us freedom-loving people, developed our science and industries or infused into us the democratic spirit.

2. Britain never quitted our land ; rather we forced her to quit us. Fifty or sixty years of non-violent freedom-movement made the atmosphere too hot for Britain to remain any longer in India.

3. It is absolutely wrong to say that during British rule, there was no corruption, no indiscipline, no injustice, no favouritism, no nepotism etc.

4. The cost of living in India during British rule was undoubtedly much cheaper than now but the Britishers did

not make it cheap for us. Everything all over the world was much cheaper before the last two World Wars, and everything all over the world has now grown much costlier. Our explosive population is one of the most important causes of the shooting prices of the essential commodities. The next important cause is the industrialisation of our country. The third cause is undoubtedly our defence expenditure.

5. If Britain was not responsible for the communal riots in India, the raids in Kashmir, was it some ghost country that brought about all these things ?

6. Even if we had not been in the Commonwealth of Nations, do you mean to say, gentlemen, that Canada or Australia would not have helped us with such enormous quantities of food supply ? We are not in the Communist Bloc, and yet how is it that Russia has been helping us more than any other country in the world ? How is it that some of the European countries, who belong to no power bloc such as Germany, Yugoslavia, Austria, Greece, Italy, have been helping us whenever we needed their help with machineries, scientific or technical aid, and even with arms and ammunition ?

RESULTS

First Speaker	—90	out of 100 marks.
Second Speaker	—75	out of 100 marks.
Third Speaker	—50	out of 100 marks.
Fourth Speaker	—30	out of 100 marks.
Fifth Speaker	— 0	out of 100 marks.
Sixth Speaker	— 0	out of 100 marks.

REVIEW

The first speaker has done admirable well ; his arguments are particularly convincing ; he is quite logical and well-balanced in his views ; he does not mince facts ; he is guided also by his personal convictions which reflect his personality.

The second speaker has done almost equally well ; his refutations are quite invincible ; he too is perfectly logical and well-balanced in his views.

There is a great difference between the first speaker and the third speaker ; the third speaker can not put forward equally irrefutable arguments ; and that is why, his position becomes considerably weak.

The fourth speaker is still much weaker than all the preceding speakers in the defence of his own position ; he occasionally lapses into errors of judgment.

Both the fifth and the sixth speakers are equally bad because both of them make mis-statements of facts, and both are equally prejudiced in their minds.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

It is a pity that out of eighteen candidates, only six candidates look part in the discussion, while the rest were "dummies". It shows how Indian boys lack courage or forwardness or initiative in the performance of a task. It also shows how some of the performers have betrayed their "bad blood" or prejudice both of which they should try to correct or remove before they come up for any of the tests of the Services Selection Board.

Discussion No. 2

IS THE U.N.O. A SUCCESS OR A FAILURE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, the very fact that the number of the members of the United Nations has exceeded one hundred at present proves the success of the United Nations. The League of Nations, which was organized just after the termination of the first World War was a total failure. But the U.N.O. has been successful because its charter has been followed strictly by most of the member-nations. The only places where it has failed is South Africa and Portugal. South Africa has not been made to realise her pernicious policy of apartheid, or even Portugal has not been made to feel the unfairness of her Colonialism, although both apartheid and Colonialism have lost their sinister supremacy in both the countries respectively. Since the organisation of the United Nations, nations have developed an attitude of settling international disputes, not by force, but by some amicable method *i.e.* by negotiation and by other peaceful ways and means. Besides, the chief concern of the United Nations has been to help the development of some of the under-developed countries. War is no longer regarded as the only means of settling international disputes.

Formerly, most of the bigger nations (Western nations) believed in exploiting the smaller nations on the excuse of civilizing them (the latter nations). But this fiction or myth of trusteeship has been completely removed by the United Nations, and that is why, we find today, many of the countries in Africa and Asia have become independent of the guardianship or

trusteeship of the white races i.e. the Europeans, who having had taken the lead in science and industries took advantage of the backward East and exploited her in many ways.

The two major power blocs i.e. America and Russia—have joined their hands in the organisation of the United Nations, and that is one of the chief reasons why for the last twenty five-years there has not been any major conflict in the human world, and also why there may not be any such conflict in the near future unless America and Russia themselves come to war with each other.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I am afraid, the previous speaker has made some mis-statements of facts. Apartheid in South Africa and Colonialism of Portugal are still raging wild inspite of the resolutions of the United Nations against these two great international evils. So far the unification of the Congo is concerned, Russia, Britain and a few other countries refused to supply troops. This is not the way of strictly adhering to the U.N.O charter which my honourable friend has pointed out or rather greatly stressed. Besides, the U N O. has not yet been able to neutralise some of the trouble spots in the East and the West—Viet-Nam, Indonesia, Taiwan, Cuba, East Germany etc.

As a matter of fact, there is no equality between the member-nations of the U.N.O. because the U.S.A., U.S.S.R., U.K. and France always consider themselves as the major nations or as the major members, and consequently, their attitude or demeanour towards the smaller or minor nations is not very fair or congenial; and that is why, there is not much of a sincere cooperation among the various members of this world organisation. Consequently, the present atmosphere in the United Nations is rather tense than peaceful or amicable.

The Security Council is the chief organ of the U.N.O., and it has allowed the five major nations (the Big Five) and none else the Veto power with the result that every international problem is decided in accordance with the interests of the

Big Five, and not of the smaller nations. That is why, there is much of unfairness and injustice in the settlement of certain international disputes. The U.N.O., as a matter of fact, appears to be just like a Packed Jury.

Then again, there is no legal sanction behind the resolutions of the United Nations Organisation because otherwise its resolution condemning South Africa for her policy of apartheid, or Portugal in her Colonialism would have succeeded in bringing about some kind of favourable results. But has the U.N.O. been able to bring round South Africa or Portugal to their senses? What is happening now-a-days in Viet Nam is also connived at by the United Nations because in this conflict U.S.A. is the ring-leader while China and Russia may be pulling the wire from behind the screen.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I feel strongly like the first speaker that the U.N.O. has been an admirable success in many directions. The two chief agencies of the U.N.O. namely, W.H.O.—the World Health Organisation—, and UNESCO—the United Nations Ethical, Scientific, Cultural Organisation—, have been doing a lot of good work in all parts of the world, particularly, by carrying on health campaigns and literacy campaigns in the backward countries of Africa and India and also in many of the island territories of South East Asia. The World Health Organisation has eradicated many of the epidemic diseases such as small pox, malaria, typhoid fever, black fever, cholera, dysentery, tuberculosis, plague and a few other diseases which take heavy tolls of lives particularly in the economically poor and scientifically deficient countries of the world. The United Nations Ethical, Scientific, Cultural Organisation has done also equally good work in the fields of literacy, scientific development, moral uplift and cultural advancement particularly in the under-developed countries of Latin America, Africa, India and in the Far East. Further, the U.N.O. has been helping the under-developed countries by advancing financial and technical aids to them so that these backward countries may be able to come up to the level of some of the progressive countries of the

world. The World Bank has been instituted by the U.N.O. and it has helped many of the poor countries in maintaining or improving their economy. The U.N.O. has also solved many of the knotty political problems of the world,—the Suez problem, the Korea problem, the Cuba problem, the Congo problem, the West Irian problem etc. It has thereby succeeded in averting world conflicts like the two great conflicts of 1914 and 1939.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am afraid, the previous speaker has taken rather an optimistic view and has thereby exaggerated the achievements of the U.N.O. which has done very little by way of settlement of any of the international problems.

It is a fact that the Congo problem could not be fully solved by the U.N.O. for want of cooperation from some of the leading member-nations of this World Organisation; for example, Russia, France, Britain, Northern Rhodesia refused to discharge their duties in connection with the Congo issue. The one great defect of the U.N.O. is that it has no standing army in order to enforce some of its resolutions whenever peaceful negotiations fail. The Congo problem cost two precious lives—Dag Hammarskjöld and Lumumba—over and above several thousands of other common lives, before it could be finally solved. India, of course, helped a good deal by sending some of her armed forces to Congo. The U.N.O. never solved the Suez problem or the Cuba problem. It was the diplomacy of both Kennedy and Khrushchev which was really responsible for the amicable settlement of the Cuban problem; otherwise it would have triggered the third World War. Has the U.N.O. been able to do anything so far in connection with the Viet-Nam conflict? I am afraid, it cannot because the two major members of the U.N.O., namely, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. are interested in this particular game, and China too who is not a member of the U.N.O., is also interested in it from behind the screen. The Viet-Nam chaos may lead any moment to a world chaos, because as far as I can see, U.S.A. is trying to secure China and wedge her against Russia. Hence, my honest opinion is that the U.N.O. is an impotent machinery for all practical purposes,

or it is a machinery contrived by U.S.A. and U.K. to extend their own political and economic supremacy all over the world, or more truly to pave the way to the complete liquidation of Communism which is becoming a growing menace to the human world.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, you will all agree with me that peace and security in the human world can never be brought about by armed conflicts or wars, and as Mahatma Gandhi has repeatedly told us that war breeds war because hatred and enmity breed nothing but hatred and enmity in return; and hence, I strongly believe that some World Organisation like the United Nations can stop the frequent repetition of armed conflicts and also can sow the seed of love and friendliness among the various races and peoples of the world. Who can deny that the conflicts between South and North Korea, in Indo-China, in Kashmir between Pakistan and India, in several parts of Africa, have not been dissolved by the intervention of the United Nations? Egypt could never independently solve the Suez Canal problem in the face of such strong and powerful nations such as Britain, France, Belgium, Israel and a few other interested countries unless the U N O came in between for an amicable settlement. Ofcourse, complete or permanent peace and harmony can never be achieved by any means or by any authority in the world; but surely, comparative peace and harmony can be achieved by such a largely representative international body like the United Nations.

You know, gentlemen, that the chief cause of war is the lust for wealth and power; and you know also that it is very difficult to conquer greed of any kind; but then, if a world organisation like the United Nations constantly checks or prevents the greedy nations from proceeding to exploit other nations by persuasion or force, such greed for power and wealth can positively be reduced to a great extent as it has been already done in the case of the major nations who have developed the nobler instinct of lending all sorts of material

aid to the backward countries for their developments—in science, industries, trade, commerce, culture, technology etc , although I will never deny in the face of facts that certain nations have got in them such deep-rooted greed that it is difficult for them to forget their depradatory or plundering instinct as America is betraying these days in Viet-Nam.

Last of all, the U.N.O. has succeeded in equalising the various races in the sense that the white races are slowly and gradually forgetting their superiority complex as the dark races are consequently forgetting their inferiority complex. Rudyard Kipling, that mischievous Anglo-Indian poet, accentuated racialism to its bitter climax in the earlier decades of the twentieth century but now the West is becoming the East and the East too is becoming the West, and the two are merging into one another just as more than one hundred white and dark races have merged into the United Nations Organisation. This is surely, a distinct triumph on the part of the U N O.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, if we look to the economic point of view, the United Nations is a great burden upon the smaller countries which have become members of the Organisation for protection and advancement but which are too poor to share the expenses of the Organisation whether for administration or for military operation. As a matter of fact, you must be knowing, my friends, how some of the major nations refused to pay their own quota of the expenses when the Secretary-General sounded a warning to all the member-nations that the U.N.O. would collapse due to its financial bankruptcy. But who listened to his warning? Every nation thought that she should not burn her fingers for pulling out the chestnut from the fire in order to feed or save other nations. In spite of all sorts of professions of internationalism every nation lived for herself alone and looked to her own interest. Can any of you, gentlemen tell me that Britain, Russia, U.S A , France or any other country, who is a member of the U N O , is altruistic in spirit in any sense? I am afraid, none can say like that unless he is blind.

Then again, there are countries who refuse to be members of the U.N.O., while there are others who have quitted the Organisation. How would you tackle such countries when they become aggressive to their weaker neighbours just as China became aggressive to India in 1962 and dislocated many of her development projects and disturbed her economy seriously. Now that U.S.A. has been ruthlessly bombarding Viet Nam for the last two years, can any other nation dare interfere with U.S.A.? What is the use then of the U.N.O. if it can not interfere on such occasions? That is why, I say that the U.N.O. is a regular farce or a self-interested body or a perfectly impotent organization that can contribute nothing to world peace or world harmony or world development.

Seventh Speaker

Genlemen, I do not deny that the United Nations Organisation has got certain shortcomings but they are not so serious as have been depicted by some of my friends. I want to know from you, gentlemen, which organisation in the very beginning can claim to be perfect in every respect? Was the League of Nations perfect? It would have never failed if some of the leading nations had given the due support to it. The U.N.O. has lived for a much longer time than the League of Nations, and I am sure, it will live much longer still if some of us do not back out from it. Rome was not built in a day, and so we can not expect the U.N.O. to be built up on rock during the space of eighteen years only, during which it has stood manv a storm and stress and has tided over manv a political and economic crisis. As none of us loves war or any kind of armed conflict, so we should prepare the ground for love and brotherhood through this mighty World Organisation. Who knows that some day in near or distant future, this Organisation will not be the solid foundation for a stable world government? Who knows that when the world nations will have come to the same level of scientific and industrial development and economic prosperity, all will gladly join this great World Organisation and make it a great family tree under the shade of which all of us will be able to live peacefully and happily through all circumstances of our existence on earth? Just two

decades ago we had suffered the terrible ravages of the Second World War, and I am sure, we have learned the lessons of such suicidal conflicts, and I hope, better reason, better understanding, better outlook on human affairs will dawn in us in place of ignorance, prejudice, corruption, moral and spiritual degradation, and in that case, I hope, the U.N.O. will be an ideal institution of universal freedom, universal equality, universal prosperity and universal happiness. Therefore, gentlemen, I strongly recommend that all of us should stick to this great World Organisation—this Noah's Ark— which saved the human couples, the animal couples, the bird couples and couples of all other species from permanent extinction when the Great Deluge flooded the entire face of the earth !

RESULTS

First Speaker gets	45	out of 100 marks
Second Speaker gets	50	„ „ „
Third Speaker gets	55	„ „ „
Fourth Speaker gets	30	„ „ „
Fifth Speaker gets	40	„ „ „
Sixth Speaker gets	60	„ „ „
Seventh Speaker gets	75	„ „ „

REVIEW

The last speaker has done the best because he shows his foresight and insight into the problem. The sixth speaker has fared the next best because he has given good arguments and also facts and figures. The first speaker opened the discussion nicely but flagged out gradually till the end. The other speakers have just argued on the arguments of their preceding speakers but have brought forward nothing new, and therefore, there is no special credit for them inspite of their good manner of putting their arguments. The fourth speaker is conspicuous by his brevity and absence of originality.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

It is gratifying that out of ten candidates, as many as seven took an active part in the discussion, which shows clearly that our boys are getting interested in international affairs. These are the days of internationalism, and hence, it is gratifying that our boys are marching with the times.

Discussion No. 3

IS CO-EDUCATION A CURSE OR A BLESSING ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, I am afraid, you will regard me as a very orthodox or conservative person belonging almost to the eighteenth century if I say that co-education is positively a curse, and it can never be a blessing in our country so long there is no perfect freedom between the two sexes as they have it in U.S.A., and you must be knowing that even in countries where the two sexes are perfectly free there are schools and colleges exclusively for girls. I offer the following arguments for your serious consideration before you approve of my statement against co-education :—

1. In our country co-education is permitted only in the lower school classes, and then there is a long gap between the school classes and the university classes where, of course, there is co-education under rather a painful necessity because post-graduate studies are conducted only in the universities and not in the colleges. This long gap creates a great unfamiliarity between the two sexes, and consequently, when they come in touch with each other at the university stage, a lot of *garbar* i.e. indiscipline takes place between them. It is no fault of either boys or girls if they go wrong; it is rather the fault of their age that leads to so much of illicit contacts, elopements, undesirable marriages, and tragic separations in the long run.

2. Even some of the professors in England, where is so much of sex freedom is allowed, say that what to speak of the boys but even their married professors and the venerable

old Principal make love to their girl pupils in co-educational colleges, very often leading to mis-alliances, illicit contacts and divorces or legal separations between the Professors and their wives or between the old Principal and his old wife ! In a country like India which is yet so backward in sex freedom, you should expect much worse results in the co-educational institutions.

3. Neither the boys nor the girls nor even the professors can concentrate much of their attention on their studies in co-educational institutions, because their mind is constantly distracted in the class-room, in the library, in the reading-room, and even in the laboratory. The boys, the girls and even their professors become fashionable in their dress in order to be conspicuous in the eyes of the opposite sex with the result that there is little study but much of display of trousers and sarees or salwar and kamiz !

4. In the lower school classes when the children of both the sexes are too young their sex-instinct does not develop, or rather they are not at all sex conscious, and therefore little harm is done to either the boys or the girls by co-education. But in the universities, both the sexes are full-grown youths, and as such, they feel the full surge of the sex instinct, and consequently, it is very difficult for them to think of the consequences of any intimate contact between themselves.

5. Most of the boys and girls in India are sex-starved because of the want of freedom between the sexes, and consequently, when they meet in the university as students, they try to feed their sex instinct with full vengeance. That is why, it is most dangerous to bring together the hungry wolves and the hungry lambs !

6. If co-education were really a blessing, may I like to know from you, gentlemen, why in most of the European and American countries there are still schools and colleges exclusively for girls or women ?

7. May I like to know also from you, gentlemen, what special benefit would either the boys or the girls derive by studying together in the same institution ? Can you justify

any way the pernicious system which has been introduced by many of the educational institutions? I can do it for you, gentlemen, only to prove that it is a wicked and pernicious system which is chiefly responsible for all sorts of moral indiscipline in most of the progressive countries. The backward countries never have the courage or the imprudence to introduce such an evil system into their educational institutions. In our country atleast, I can say most assuredly that co-education is getting popular, not because it is liked by the guardians but because it has been found by the educational authorities, particularly by the managements of the private institutions that co-education is the best way of popularising an institution, of attracting the largest number of students of both the sexes, of earning a lot of money through the tuition and other fees which is often necessary for maintaining a private institution when no sufficient grant-in-aid is available from the Government in order to maintain a good library, a properly equipped laboratory, spacious class-rooms play-grounds for atleast some of the important games, such as hockey, football, volleyball, basketball, badminton and tennis, or even a commodious common room or hall, and also attached hostels for accommodating students who come from distant villages for their college or university studies. But would you like to make education a commercial commodity or a profitable business?

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, the previous speaker is not only conservative or orthodox in his views but he is also ignorant of the common psychology of the human mind. He does not seem to know that if sufficient familiarity is allowed between the two sexes during the student life, they become more adaptable to each other in their married life, because at an early stage they come to each other's mind, each other's heart, each other's temperament, and on the whole, each other's character, they can choose their life's partner much more easily and safely.

Then again, the previous speaker makes certain mis-statements of facts particularly when he says that there is no co-education in the colleges of our country, that in most of the

colleges the boy students and the professors make love to the girl pupils, that there are plenty of cases of elopement from the co-educational institutions. and that co-education often leads to undesirable and unhappy marriages leading invariably to divorce or legal separation. I do not deny that there may be certain stray cases of this nature but they are very few in number. Are there no cases of elopement, illicit connection, unhappy marriage and divorce or legal separation even outside co-educational institutions ? Surely, there are many.

Our boys and girls are definitely sex-starved, and that is why, they are all the more hungry for the fulfilment of their sex instinct if no opportunity is given to them during their adolescence either at home or in society or in the educational institutions or anywhere else. The more you will shut out woman from man, the more both man and woman will become hungry for each other. Therefore, in my humble opinion, the best way of subduing their passion or of disciplining their sex instinct is to bring them in touch with each other as frequently as possible. Is it not a fact that every man has an unusual curiosity for the woman who goes in a *burka* or who constantly lives behind the *purdah* ? Can anybody deny that a flower hidden from view is far more attractive than a flower which is constantly exposed to view ?

I am sure, gentlemen, that all of you will agree with me when I say that by mutual familiarity and contact, the various qualities of man and woman develop to their full height and also they are neutralised by each other in order to make them adaptable to each other. That is the real benefit of co-education. In our country, it is the guardians who choose life's partners for their boys and girls and therefore, before marriage very few of our boys and girls, come to know the real character, temperament, behaviour, views, ideas or the real outlook on life of each other ; and that is why, after marriage there is so much of disagreement between the two married partners ; which makes their conjugal life so unhappy. Co-education, therefore, in my honest opinion, is the most necessary stepping-stone to a happy marriage.

It is absolutely wrong on the part of the previous speaker

to have said that co-education distracts the minds of the students and the teachers and thereby disturbs their studies. In my honest opinion, co-education is a source of inspiration to students as well as to teachers because everybody wants to show himself or herself at their best before their opposite sex, and naturally, there is a distinct competition among the students—boys and girls—to bring out and display the best out of them; and for the same reason, the teachers too compete with their colleagues in order to outdo one another in their ability to teach!

Third Speaker

I should like to assure you, gentlemen, that I am neither orthodox nor conservative nor ignorant of the common psychology of the human mind like the first speaker, and yet I would like to say that co-education is more a curse than a blessing for the following reasons :—

1. It is co education which is chiefly responsible for all kinds of student-unrest, student-indiscipline and student-revolt, because woman is a great inciting agent to man. If woman incites man to do anything—good or evil— he will atonce do it. In most of the disturbances in the colleges or in the universities, it is the girl students who show the way or who lead the agitations and thereby intensify the tempo of the agitations.

2. It is a fact that woman is the chief bone of contention between man and man in all fields of rivalry or competition. In the educational institutions also girl students form the chief bone of contention and produce all sorts of rivalry, jealousy, contention or competition, ultimately leading to clashes between various groups of boy students.

3. In most of the examinations, the teachers show a good deal of favouritism to the girl students with the result that many of the good boys go down in their places at the final examination while the girl students go up, and thereby the future of many really good students is ruined or sealed up.

4. The greatest injury which co-education does to woman is that it makes her masculine and robs her of all her

feminine charms which alone make her so dear and attractive to her husband. By constantly coming in touch with man, woman loses her shyness, modesty, sweetness, tenderness, softness of heart and so many other feminine virtues, and that is why, such a woman is never liked by man to be his life's partner. It is too much of mixing between the two sexes whether in educational institutions or in offices or in the workshops or in the factories or in the shops which is taking away the real romance of married life in most of the western countries where man and woman move and mix with each other too freely and too intimately.

5 In medical colleges or even in non-medical educational institutions where biology, zoology, physiology, anatomy, or even botany are being taught there are many topics which come up for discussion or explanation and which are very delicate for the purpose particularly when there is a mixed class *i.e.* a class of boys and girls. The topics, for example, of the physiology or anatomy of the male or the female sex organ or of the female breast, buttocks and other limbs, the topics of procreation, pregnancy, delivery etc., all are delicate for the purpose of discussion in a mixed class of boy and girl students. Even the teacher feels embarrassed while discussing such topics.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, whatever the previous speaker has said against co-education seems to be wrong, illogical and absurd. May I point out to him as well as to you all how co-education is natural, healthy and economical? Instead of wasting money on building up separate educational institutions for boys and girls it is better to build up co educational institutions as many as possible so that largest number of boys and girls can be educated simultaneously.

In the Western countries, co-education is followed up from the kindergarten classes right up to the university classes. Most of the women's colleges or schools which are found nowadays in the European and American countries were built up

centuries ago because in those early days there was no freedom of the two sexes particularly among the Roman Catholics who used to observe and even now-a-days observe some kind of segregation between the nuns and the monks or the friars in most of the cloisters and the monasteries, just as the orthodox Hindus and Muslims in India still observe a stricter segregation of the two sexes in all spheres of activity.

We should know, gentlemen, that in order to make our conjugal life happy we should try to understand properly the psychology of the minds of both man and woman at an early stage *i.e.* from school life to university life, and co education is one of the best ways of knowing the secrets of the minds of both man and woman. Nobody can deny that before marriage both man and woman should understand each other fully or to a great extent *i.e.* they must know other's faults and virtues ; otherwise ignorance of these things would give such a rude jolt shock soon after marriage that the conjugal tie would be snapped all of a sudden.

I want to point out to you, gentlemen, that when man and woman want to go wrong, they can do so, whether they are brought up strictly behind closed doors or in perfect freedom, whether woman goes in *kurka* or in 'topless', whether she is brought up in a cloister or in a co-educational institution, whether she is made to work twenty-four hours with man in the offices, workshops and factories or in her own home with all the doors and windows closed against even the sunlight ! Can anybody certify truthfully that the Muslim women who remain behind the *pardah* and go out of door in *burka* are more modest in character than the Hindu women who go without the veil on their face and who work with men in many of the public places ? Or can anybody say honestly that Indian women are better in character or happier in their married life than their counterparts in the western world simply because Indian women are much less free than the European or the American women ? If not, how can you say, gentlemen, that co-education spoils the character of boys and girls or ruins their married happiness afterwards ?

Honestly speaking, is there any difference between man and woman except in their physiology or in their biological

function ? The only difference is that man is the procreator while woman is the bearer of the burden of procreation or that man is slightly physically stronger while woman is slightly weaker ; otherwise in mind, heart, temperament, human instincts, intellectual capacity there is absolutely no difference between man and woman ; and therefore, why should boys and girls be educated in different schools and colleges ?

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am sorry, I can not agree with those who equalise men and women, and on that ground, they want to educate them in the same institution or give them the same kind of education. Man, in my opinion, is born for all kinds of rough and stern jobs while woman is born for more delicate and refined jobs ; man is born as the protector of woman and her children while woman is born to look after the children and to take care of all kinds of home affairs or domestic duties. Nature has made this kind of distribution of labour between man and woman in order to develop the personality of each to its full height ; but unfortunately, man has violated many of the laws of nature by harnessing woman to many of the masculine jobs, and that is why, probably, woman has become such an unnatural, uncongenial and unhappy partner to man. In the western world there is truly speaking no family life, no domestic harmony, no conjugal happiness, nothing of the kind. We Indians and probably the people of many other countries where woman has not become so free, there is still much of conjugal love and domestic happiness or harmony. The western world has become almost beastly, not only because of its lust for wealth and power but also because of the undue freedom of woman. Woman has ceased to be a woman ! Look at her dress, her manners, her sex-perversions, her aggressive spirit in all directions. Woman of the Western world thinks that man is her rival, her enemy but in the eastern world she regards man as her real partner in joys and sorrows of life, as her helper and protector at home as well as outside home just as man also thinks of woman in the same manner. Hence, in my opinion, co-education, co-teaching, co-work of

any kind between man and woman can have no beneficial or healthful effect upon any of the two sexes.

From the very dawn of the human race, we have noticed that man has been playing the role of the protector and also the role of the procurer of daily bread, while woman has been playing the role of bearing children and looking after them and arranging the home or the nest which both man and woman build up; but then, man out of his own whims introduced woman into his own sphere probably because he wanted to enjoy more of her company, and this alone has been the cause of woman's perversion and man's fall. I am, therefore, not in favour of education atleast in our country to put our women on the war-path, to make our married or domestic life miserable in every possible way, to rob woman of all her womanly virtues, to make the struggle for existence far more acute than it has hitherto become, to make man an effeminate creature or rather a puppet in the hands of woman!

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	50	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	50	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	40	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	30	„	„	„

REVIEW

Practically, all the speakers sail in the same boat; they have given the same sort of arguments which have become old and stale; none has shown any originality in thinking; all have secured practically the same marks except the last speaker who has put forward very strange but interesting arguments.

Board's Official Comment

Our boys seem to be much against the freedom of women although many of them desire to have such freedom without knowing the cost of it. None of the views seems to be of any practical value.

Discussion No. 4.

IS CHILD MARRIAGE BETTER OR WORSE THAN ADULT MARRIAGE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, there is no question of any kind of comparison between child marriage and adult marriage. No civilized person, no cultured human being, no rational creature would prefer child marriage because child marriage is the primitive form of marriage, because child marriage is prevalent only among the backward, uncultured, uncivilized races. Child marriage was the custom in ancient India among the Hindus. It is laid down in the Hindu *Shastras* or scriptures that a girl must be married before she attains the age of eight while a boy should be matched with her in age *i.e.* he should be also married before he attains the age of ten or twelve. But such marriages are inconceivable in the Western world where boys or girls are not permitted to marry before they attain the age of twenty-one and eighteen respectively. But why did the ancient Hindus prescribe such a rule for marriage? They thought that if a girl is married at an early age she can adapt herself to her husband's family more easily and properly which she cannot do if she is married at any later age. So far the boys are concerned, they cannot possibly adjust themselves to their partners in life unless they are married at an early age.

But to my mind, gentlemen, all such arguments appear to be absurd and silly. Marriage is a great responsibility, and hence, it is the duty of each of the partners to know the other

quite well before they launch their joint life *i.e.* married life, because without such intimate knowledge of each other nobody can live together amicably or peacefully with anybody till death. Ordinarily speaking, neither a boy nor a girl develops sufficient brains to study his or her partner unless they attain some kind of maturity—maturity in body, maturity in mind, maturity in age. That is why, the civilized world, whether in West or in the East, has laid down the rule that nobody should be allowed to marry unless and until one attains maturity.

Child marriage is most harmful to both boys and girls from the biological or physiological point of view. Both boys and girls become sex-conscious or rather feel the sex desire or sex impulse at quite an early age, and if they are married at the age of ten or twelve, they will surely feel tempted to have sexual intercourse with the result that either their physical health will be greatly damaged or that they will get children too early and will be prematurely burdened with the load of family responsibilities which they can possibly bear on their own shoulders independent of their guardians. If children are born to them at such an early age, they are bound to be weaklings—mentally and physically deficient children; and in that case, what kind of a race or a nation they will build up? A race of cripples or weaklings.

Then again, if men and women marry at an early age, they will not have the opportunity of knowing each other's defects or deficiencies, and as such, throughout their married life they will feel most unhappy. Do you want, gentlemen, unhappy marriage, divorce, legal separation and many other evils which follow or accompany child marriage?

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, what the previous speaker has said may be partly true but we should also consider the other side of the question. What is marriage after all? It is both enjoyment and responsibility. How can little children enjoy marriage unless they are developed in body as well as in mind? Can a boy of ten make love to a girl of six or eight? Or can a girl

of eight understand anything of sex life or the romance of married life unless and until she attains her puberty, unless and until her limbs fully blossom ? She can atmost prematurely conceive but she can never enjoy the pleasure or romance of the love-play or of the sex contact. Besides, pleasure does not lie only in the bodily union ; it lies also in the communion of the minds, the hearts of the two married partners. You can enjoy the full bliss of married life if you are mature in both body and mind.

As for the responsibilities of marriage, one can not undertake them unless one is properly equipped with the means and ways of the struggle for existence. It is criminal to marry and to procreate unless one can earn sufficiently to maintain his wife and children. But in India, China and other backward countries people marry recklessly and also procreate most blindly without thinking for a moment about the future of their progeny. In all backward countries, people are in favour of early marriage and also in favour of bringing out as many children as possible as the dogs and the cat bring out their pups and kitten. In ancient India and even recently the Hindus used to marry at a very early age, used to keep several wives, used to beget any number of children, and used to marry four or five times till the age of eighty when they could not even walk with their backbone straight. The Chinese too have been following the same reckless method, and that is why, China's population is now-a-days over seven hundred millions while India's population is above five hundred millions ! My honourable friends, would you still recommend child marriage or early marriage ?

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, with all the arguments put forward against child marriage I am still in favour of child marriage. Just consider my arguments quite seriously few a moment :—

Child marriage ensures real conjugal love, and in most cases the married partners feel happy throughout their life. There are very few cases of divorce or legal separation in India. But look at America or England or any other country of Europe,

particularly, France ! What do you find ? They marry late long after the attainment of maturity, and they marry also after a long period of love-making, and yet every morning you will hear or come across several cases of divorce and remarriage. Is that an enviable life or the life of animals and beasts in the jungles ? Where goes the civilization of Europe or America ? What remains of the maturity of body and mind of the people ? What romance is there in changing partners of life—what happiness, what harmony, what domestic peace ? Are not Indians thousand times happier than the Americans and the Europeans in this particular respect ? Would still vote for adult marriage ? Miss Catherine Mayo wrote a book under the title, '*Mother India*' in which she exposed the evil of child marriage, while K. L. Gauba wrote another book in reply under the title, '*Uncle Sam*' in which he exposed the darker side of the sex-relations of the Americans. But my view or choice is not prejudiced by either Miss Mayo or Mr. Gauba. I have pointed out to you, gentlemen, the facts and figures, and I want you to decide either in favour of adult marriage or of child marriage.

Fourth Speaker.

Gentlemen, whatever may be the arguments of the preceding speakers for or against child marriage or adult marriage, I would always vote for adult marriage because of the following reasons :—

1. Adult marriage is the universal system of marriage in the modern world except in the backward countries.

2. We must always march with the times, and not go backwards like a crab and advocate a custom (child marriage) which was prevalent in India five centuries ago or even earlier.

3. The personality of woman particularly suffers when she is married at an early age ; and the future of man also is considerably hampered or darkened or even ruined by child marriage. A man grows prematurely old when he is saddled with the responsibilities of marriage at an early age.

4. There shall be always some kind of disagreement between the two married partners whether they are married early

or late, because human nature or character is not the same all over the world, and it cannot be made the same by force or compulsion ; and that is why, we find so many cases of divorce and legal separation in the Western world even after adult marriage. In India there are very few of such cases simply because there was no legislation on divorce ; and that is why, in spite of serious disagreements between married partners they could not, separate from each other or remarry. Of course men were permitted to marry any number of times but women were not whether they were widows or discarded by their husbands.

5. Adult marriage brings out healthy children who make a strong nation which is essential for defence of one's country against foreign aggression. Besides, healthy children mean healthy bodies and healthy minds which are equally essential for all kinds of development of a nation. Look at ourselves ; how wretched we are in physique, how deficient we are in mind ; how incapable we are of any kind of advancement ! It is only the Punjabees and the Sindhis who are slightly better in health than most other races of our country ; otherwise, look at the Bengalees, Oriyas, Biharis, Ujjians and some of the South Indian races as well as the mercantile Bombayites, Maharashtrians and the Marwaris who occupy practically the whole of Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh. Are these races healthy or strong in any sense. Those who are weak or unhealthy in body can not be expected to be intellectually bright or morally courageous. Indians, on the whole, form a degenerate nation simply because of polygamy and child marriage.

Fifth Speaker.

Gentlemen, my previous speaker has very strongly advocated adult marriage but he has forgotten totally some of the wholesome aspects of child marriage. Our Hindu ancestors were very wise in the matter of marriage. They used to live in joint families. They were perfectly aware of the hot climate of India which ripens prematurely not only fruits, flowers and vegetables but also human beings in the sense that men and women in India become biologically fit or mature much earlier than those in the colder countries like Europe and America ; and hence, early marriage is necessary in the case of Indians otherwise both

men and women would grow old and come to decay prematurely. It is a fact that girls of eight or ten in India, China and other countries, in the East can conceive and become mothers. Similarly, boys of ten or twelve also in India can easily procreate ; but in America or in Europe no girl matures before sixteen and no boy attains his maturity before twenty

Then again, our Hindu ancestors used to live in joint families, and naturally every married girl had to learn the ways and means of adapting herself to such a pattern of family in which nobody could pull on without mutual co-operation or submission. Everybody knows that it is only at an early or tender age that one can learn the ways of adjustability or adaptability because when one grows comparatively old, one's backbone becomes stiff and inflexible i.e. one's ideas and views become comparatively fixed or rigid and also one's personality becomes rigid, obstinate, dogmatic and unpliable ; and hence, one can not live amicably in a joint family. That was one of the chief reasons why our ancient forefathers believed in child marriage

Some of the previous speakers have pointed out that it is only at an early age that human minds can know one another better because as we advance in age, we become hypocritical and we try to conceal our true nature from others, and naturally, how can we know each other and venture into any matrimonial alliance in order to ensure our conjugal happiness ? That is why, inspite of adult marriage in the western countries there are so many cases of divorce and legal separation whereas there are very few such cases in India although the divorce law was passed four or five years ago.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, the manner in which "dating" (or mating ?) is raging in U.S.A. these days, I am afraid, sooner or later U.S.A. will have to introduce the system of child marriage. The guardians, the parents, the clergymen and even the government of U.S.A. are feeling very much perturbed on account of this "dating" business because the teenagers have started making appointments with their opposite sexes to meet in the

restaurants, coffee-houses, picture-houses, river banks, sea-shores, and even in the mountain glens and forest dales ! The guardians and the parents are complaining that they are being financially ruined by the extravagant expenses on account of their children's dating. The clergymen have started crying that the whole nation is getting demoralised. The Government is worrying about the problem of legalising abortion ! All these delicate problems would have arisen in our country too had we not followed rigidly the convention of child marriage. Just compare the days in India just half a century ago with the present times. Do you not find, gentlemen, that most of the adults of our country whether married or unmarried are crying for the legalisation of abortion ? What does it signify ? It signifies that both the sexes in our country have become unduly free, that child marriage has almost completely disappeared from our country, and that evil consequences of adult marriage are appearing on the very surface of our national or social life.

There is no sense in marching with the times if the times go wrong *i. e.* if men and women are on the war path. So far the tendency of the modern age is concerned there is a distinct militant spirit everywhere—among the students, among men and women, among the political leaders and even among the heads of the governments. Do you mean to say, my honourable friends, that the world is going the right way ? Should we follow the lead of such a world and trigger armed conflicts and wars everywhere ? Certainly not. To march with the times and advocate adult marriage, advocate divorce or legal separation, advocate abortion would be merely inviting disasters to the human race. I am prepared to be branded as an eighteenth century man rather than vote for adult marriage particularly when I find that adult marriage has completely poisoned conjugal love, and totally ruined domestic peace and married happiness everywhere. I would rather like to be married at the age of ten to feel eternally happy with my life's partner of five or eight. The Hindus rightly regard marriage as a spiritual union while the Christians and the Muslims regard it as a social contract. In my honest opinion, marriage should take place at a very early age and it should be indissoluble. We should not change our life's partner every new morning like beasts.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	60	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	"	50	"	"	"
Third Speaker	"	50	"	"	"
Fourth Speaker	"	50	"	"	"
Fifth Speaker	"	50	"	"	"
Sixth Speaker	"	60	"	"	"

REVIEW

All the speakers more or less have fared equally well but then their arguments are almost all alike except in the case of one or two speakers who have shown some amount of originality in arguments. But then, none of the arguments of the speakers are conclusive or convincing. They have all walked practically over the trodden grounds except one or two of the speakers whose judgment is revolutionary but not very much balanced or cogent.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

It is rather striking that all the candidates who have come before the Selection Board have taken part in the discussion. This is undoubtedly encouraging. The real psychology of the candidates must be that they are all unmarried, and hence, so keenly interested in the discussion of the topic. Any how, there is a distinct note of revolt among one or two speakers against adult marriage probably because they hear and read all sorts of concocted stories about unhappy married life in the Western World.

Discussion No. 5

WHICH OF THE EVILS WOULD YOU CHOOSE— GAMBLING OR DRINKING ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, in the first instance, I would like to know from you all, who would like to choose an evil whether gambling or drinking ? In the second instance, I would like to put you the question—how do you know that gambling and drinking are evils ? Last of all, I should like to know from you, gentlemen, whether there can be any comparison between two evils, and if so, by what standard can we judge them as such ? The proposition before us seems to be a puzzle or a riddle but in my eyes, none of them is really so. In my opinion, if drinking or gambling were really considered as evils, how is it that millions of people indulge in both gambling and drinking ? My question is, how can we judge a thing as an evil ? How can we say that gambling is an evil or even drinking is an evil ? So many big businessmen, so many millionaires and multi-millionaires gamble at Monte Carlo, which is in France and which is said to be the biggest gambling den in the world. Why do the business magnates of the various parts of the world come to Monte Carlo ? Why do others take part in the horse races or in the foot-ball or other sports pools in different parts of the world ? Why do aristocratic and most educated and cultured people all over the world indulge in drinking, and even many other ordinary people also indulge in drinking ? Do they derive any special benefit or pleasure from either drinking or gambling ?

Some people say that all people indulge in gambling only to grow rich—the poor to grow rich, the rich to grow richer and the richer to grow the richest. But do people really grow rich by gambling? On the other hand, we are told by most of the gamblers that gambling turns even millionaires into paupers overnight, and drinking too ruins a man's health and property or wealth. The proposition is, therefore, a great dilemma before us, and it is extremely difficult to choose between the two.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, why should we choose between the two—drinking or gambling? Why should we not choose both particularly when a major section of the world population indulges in both? Why should we not regard both drinking and gambling as necessary for human existence just as we regard eating and drinking (drinking water) as absolutely necessary for our existence. But is gambling really necessary for life? Or is drinking (wine) really necessary for human existence? May I put a few other questions to you, gentlemen, to clarify my position? Why do we eat and drink? Why do we put on clothes? Why do we live in houses? Why do we marry and have children? Why do we go to the pictures? Why do we smoke, chat, chum, hold parties, debates? Why do we dance, sing and go out on picnics or a hunting? Why do we go to the church or the temple or the mosque? Why do we swallow medicine or any kind of drug? Why do people take opium, hemp, morphia, tobacco? Do you mean to say, we do all these things for nothing? Can you prove that people indulge in drinking and gambling for nothing? There must be some reasons behind them. But what are those reasons? Why should we start regarding gambling or drinking as an evil? Does not gambling give a good deal of thrills when one wins the stakes? Do you not feel like dancing or jumping into the air when you win a Derby Sweep of one Lakh of rupees or more overnight? Or do you not feel a good deal of pleasure when you are intoxicated with wine? Don't you have wonderfully pleasant dreams when you smoke or drink opium? If not, why should have De Duincey, the great English writer, why should Coleridge, the great English poet, why should Keats,

another great English poet, have indulged in taking opium or wine or hemp or any other intoxicating drug? Do you mean to say, gentlemen, that the whole race of the Chinese has been indulging in opium-eating or opium-smoking for hundreds of years for nothing? Surely, not; there must be a good deal of pleasure in drinking wine or in eating opium or hemp or any other intoxicant; otherwise from the beginning man would not have indulged in drinking, smoking or in any other pastime? I call them all pastimes because they serve to divert the mind, make the mind forgetful for the time being and also lend some amount of pleasurable sensation to the body and the mind. Man needs all sorts of things that goad him to hardest and most risky jobs, and also he needs at the same time all sorts of other things which can make him forget his worries, his cares and anxieties, his sorrows and miseries and pains. Both drinking and gambling offer the human mind as well as the human body some kind of relaxation, diversion, and inspiration; and that is why, both of them are as much necessary for our existence as eating, singing, dancing, reading, pic-nicing etc. I would surely vote for both drinking and gambling by turns if I have sufficient money to spend on both; otherwise poor people can not afford to indulge in either drinking or gambling because both are expensive pastimes. It is the poor people who are ruined by drinking; and it is comparatively the poorer people who become poorer still by gambling; otherwise in my opinion, no millionaire or multi-millionaire ever goes to a gambling den to get richer but on the other hand, he goes there only to pass his time, to get some diversion from his frightfully busy time as a businessman. Ofcourse, both gambling and drinking form into a habit if once or twice you indulge in them—that is the real evil about them; otherwise none of the two is an evil at all.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, my previous speaker seems to be rather funny if not strange in the manner of his defence of both gambling and drinking, because we have been asked to choose between drinking and gambling, and not to choose both. We have to find out here which is the lesser evil of the two if both of them

are absolute necessities of life like eating and drinking (water). Drinking becomes a great evil to you if you happen to be poor and get into the habit of drinking, because in that case, you have to sacrifice all comforts and necessities of life of your wife and children, and spend most of your money on drinking wine, which would be indeed a very selfish policy. Drinking is definitely an expensive habit, and it can not be indulged in by the clerks and the schoolmasters or the peons and the chap-rasis. And yet we find that majority of drinkers in a poor country like India are the rickshaw-pullers, the workshop labourers, the railway porters, the sweepers and the *bhangis*, and why? Because they want to forget for a few moments the miseries of their life, and not because they want to get some pleasure out of drinking. How can poor people derive any pleasure out of drinking particularly when after the intoxication is over they are reminded of their poverty and miseries? And then, what stuff do the poor people drink? All poisonous liquids or solids that devitalise them and shorten their life.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I do not believe in 'airy nothings' like gambling. What is after all there in gambling except winning or losing certain stakes? What pleasure can you derive from it? I can understand the thrills of joy when a jockey wins a horse race because such winning depends much on his own skill or riding as also upon the skill or capacity of the horse that wins the race. But what earthly satisfaction can there be for a man who merely wins and collects the dividends of a race? You can win thousands of rupees overnight by one successful business deal; but does it give you any other satisfaction except the feeling that you have become the owner of a few thousands of rupees?

But so far drinking wine or opium or any other intoxicating drug is concerned, it gives your body and mind a great exhilaration. A drinker of wine as well as a smoker of opium gets the some sort of dreams—dreams that take him furthest away from the world of sorrows and pains and suffering and introduces him into a golden paradise where he can lie on a

bed of roses, listen to the sweet melodies of the birds, the music of the murmuring streams, the sighs and moans of the winds that breathe on his whole body a kind of numbness that robs the body of all its pains even when it is actually suffering. Some people say that drinking simply makes a man either howl or sing or dance or makes him lie down dead like a log of wood; while other people say that a drunkard is a great nuisance in his family or at any part or in the club because by his drunken ways he topples down chairs, breaks to pieces the crockeries and sometimes even beats others black and blue ! That may be true ; but just consider for a moment the romance of the world in which a drunken man lives—how he fancies his own wife to be a butterfly, his own children as soap bubbles, the cups and the saucers on the tea table as flies and mosquitos, and that is why he laughs at them sometimes, while at other times, he wants to chase them away and and often he brandishes his walking stick over all, fancying that the stick is a sword and the cup ; and the saucers on the table or the wife and the children sitting at the tea table are all his enemies ! That is the real romance of drinking ! Who would not like to enjoy such a romance ?

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, it seems, all the honourable speakers who have voted for either gambling or drinking are themselves gamblers or addicts to drinking. But I do not like to be any of them. I give you the following solid reasons against both gambling and drinking :—

1. Gambling is ruinous because nobody wins in gambling ; and if any body wins at all, he loses more than he wins.

2 All gamblers dream of becoming rich overnight ; but those who are born poor can never grow rich unless they work very hard for it All poor gamblers are idlers and also superstitious people. Nobody should believe in *Kismet* or fate but on the other hand should believe in hard work, diligence, perseverance—all of which are necessary for growing rich or for attaining any eminent position.

3. Rich people never gamble for growing richer but they gambling only for recreation. They take it as a pastime

whereas the poor people take it as a magic trick for growing rich overnight !

4. Most of the poor gamblers instead of growing rich grow much poorer and get literally stranded in life. It is the poor wife and the children who pay the penalty on behalf of the gambler hasband or father because they are actually thrown into the street and finally starved to death.

5 Drinking is no less an evil than gambling. It is ruinous, particularly, for the poor people because wines are very costly things which the poor people cannot afford. What the poor people actually drink are the worst type of poisonous liquors which undermine their bodily health and shorten their life. Drinking, we are told by doctors, ruins the liver and the kidney and also weakens considerably the heart, and that is how it develops fatal diseases in the body and thereby cuts short the life.

6 Wine makes one drunken or intoxicated, and makes him behave like a fool or a mad man. So long he behaves like a fool, he disturbs nobody; but when he behaves like a mad man or becomes violent he becomes a regular nuisance in the family, in society and in every public place. Everybody looks down upon a drunkard particularly when he becomes an addict. Even the richest and most aristocratic man, when heavily drunken, is much lowered in the eyes of all except in the eyes of those who are themselves drunkards. When a drunkard goes on reeling at home before his wife and children or in the public streets before the gaze of all, what do they think of him except as a beast or a monster ?

7. Drinking and gambling are such tenacious habits that they can seldom be given up, and that is why, they are all the more pernicious.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, you have listened to the arguments of the speakers. But nobody has been able to prove either gambling or drinking as good things, provided, of course, one does not form a habit of any of them. But how is it possible not to make them into habits when every action when repeated

too frequently becomes a habit. Is not smoking as much a habit with some as reading books a bit with others? Is not going to the pictures or visiting the restaurants and the coffee-houses a habit? Is not even playing certain games regularly a habit? I have seen and you, gentlemen, too must have seen that card players can never give up their card-playing, that players of hockey, football, tennis, badminton or any other outdoor game, can never forego playing them unless and until they become physically unfit. Do you mean to say that chess-playing, card-playing, singing, dancing, playing football, hockey, tennis etc are bad habits? If so, then eating food or drinking water daily is also a bad habit. Can you stop eating your food or drinking water for a single day? If you are a player of any of the indoor or outdoor games, can you resist the temptation of playing them? Certainly not.

In my honest opinion, why should we not treat both drinking and gambling as pastimes? When one works very hard, one needs some kind of diversion or recreation. Don't you think that drinking or gambling helps to divert or recreate our mind? Definitely, it does. Life is now-a-days being lived at a very high pressure, and therefore we badly need some kind of strong stimulus to whip up our wearied nerves in order to rejuvenate them, to make them ready for fresh work and also to add fresh zeal to the worker. Life is not definitely not all work just as it is not all play either. In my honest opinion, those who work little need no pastime or recreation, and hence, they have no right to drink or gamble or even to see pictures or spend hours at the restaurant or the coffee-house. The busiest and the hardest worker must drink or gamble, and it is only then he can fresh in mind and body. Ofcourse, both drinking and gambling are very costly games, and hence, unfortunately, the poor people can not indulge in them except with disastrous consequences. But if one can keep within limits, I am in favour of even the poor people enjoying some kind of cheap pastime—it may be playing cards with small stakes or drinking cheap and harmless alcohol, not daily but, say, once a week. This can never lead to any injury or harm to the person who gambles or drinks.

Seventh Speaker

Gentlemen, the last previous speaker has recommended both drinking and gambling as necessary pastimes for the hard workers. I do agree with him undoubtedly but my problem is, can any body keep within bounds in gambling or drinking particularly when we know that both are the most chronic and obstinate habits that can never be given up. They are just like that pernicious habit of visiting brothels. Nobody, uptill now in the world has talked of gambling or drinking as a good thing, and why? Because once you become an addict to them, you are a ruined man even if you are millionaire or a multimillionaire. We have seen how millionaires and multimillionaires also become paupers, not overnight but after some time when they play with heavy stakes. The tendency in gambling is that the more you lose, the more you gamble in order to make up the loss; but no gambler in the world can probably certify that he has ever made up the lost stakes. Similarly, in drinking, one may start with half of a peg of wine but if he continues drinking regularly everyday, he will go on increasing the measure from one peg to two pegs, from two pegs to three pegs without any limit unless and until he becomes completely unconscious by the intoxication of the wine. The rich people probably will not grow very poor by drinking but what will be the condition of their health? A perfectly ruined thing!

Some people very foolishly say that wine improves health; it undoubtedly does, provided it is taken in some measured quantity as advised by the doctor. But why wine alone should be regarded as the most healthful or health-giving thing when there are so many thousand other far more health-giving eatables and drinks which the world knowingly does not care to avail? Is not milk the most well-balanced food in the world? Is not *ghee* or butter or cheese or meat or egg far more invigorating than wine? And yet does any body feel more tempted to take them than to take wine? Therefore, I say, gentlemen, the drinkers of wine always want to make a good excuse for indulging in the habit which they can not; they talk of wine as a nourishing thing but no drinker of wine drinks wine on that account *i.e.* for improving his health or invigorating his body. That is why,

I would like to say, last of all, that both drinking and gambling are the worst evils which instead of cultivating must be shunned as poison. A strong poison can kill a man outright but drinking and gambling make one suffer a slow, painful and humiliating death.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50	out of 100 marks
Second Speaker	„	40	
Third Speaker		40	,
Fourth Speaker		40	,
Fifth Speaker		50	,
Sixth Speaker		40	,
Seventh Speaker		75	,

REVIEW

Only the last speaker has done well because he has advocated neither gambling nor drinking. Almost all the speakers have supported drinking or gambling, and although their arguments are quite correct yet because of their support of evils, they can not be justified. It is also interesting to note that most of the speakers have spoken again drinking and gambling; and when we go to judge their position, every body's position becomes anomalous or self-contradictory. The most interesting part of the whole game is that the proposition for discussion has been put in the form of a riddle and that is why, probably, none of the speakers except the last speaker has been able to decide between the two evils. There is no question of any choice between evils; all evils must be discouraged and voted against; and no arguments can be put forward in defence of any evil.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has nothing to comment except that most of the young candidates, who have come for interview, seem to know much more about gambling and drinking than the members of the Board probably knows!

Discussion No. 6

SHOULD CINEMA BE BANNED TO STUDENTS ?

First Speaker

Genlemen, I want to raise several counter questions - why should cinema be banned to students? Is cinema an evil? Have not students the right to have recreation? How does cinema affect the mind or the heart of the students? Is there any objection on the part of the guardians that students should not see cinema? If so, why many of the guardians take their small children to the picture-house frequently in order to show them certain pictures? Have the students been adversely affected by cinema any way? We should better trace out the adverse effects and then say that cinema should be banned to students.

In my honest opinion, cinema should not be banned to students particularly in our country where there are very few recreation clubs for students. I believe, students do need some amount of recreation occasionally because they do so much of brain work. It is a fact that if the brain is unduly exercised, the body also should be equally exercised in order to keep some kind of balance between the mind and the body. We notice certain students extremely studious. The neglect sports in the playgrounds, take no other form of physical exercise at home, seldom go to the pictures, do not even go out for a walk; and what is the result of all this hard brain work and total neglect of any kind of physical exercise or recreation? A complete breakdown of bodily health and sometimes even derangement of the brain. It is a fact that too much of brain-work makes a boy dull just as too much

of idleness or too much of indulgence in frivolous pastimes or recreations makes one a stupid boy.

In our country, cinema is probably the cheapest recreation; it is also quite a decent recreation because it does not detain any cinema-goer for more than three hours or even two hours sometimes. Students can easily attend the the matinee shows without sacrificing any of their study hours. That is why, cinema is quite a cheap and decent form of recreation. There are many students who do not and can not take part in games and sports because their colleges and universities can not possibly arrange for every one of the students to participate in every kind of game or sport; and if they were going to do, it would be very expensive affair.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I can assure you that I am neither conservative nor orthodox in my views, and yet I am not in favour of students going to the pictures. You can not deny that cinema has many baneful effects upon the students. If students had attended only classical pictures or heroic pictures or pictures of primitive human life or historical and geographical pictures, I would have never objected to their seeing such pictures. But unfortunately in our country very few of such pictures are produced; on the contrary, only romantic pictures are produced. Besides, most of the English pictures which are produced in Hollywood (U S A) are romantic, sexy and even obscene pictures atleast from our Oriental standpoint. We Indians are not used so much to kissing and embracing in public; we are not used to any nude scenes which are shown on the Hollywood Screen—scenes of bathing and dancing which expose most of the delicate feminine limbs that merely excite the sexual instinct in man and woman. Naturally, such pictures can not have any beneficial effect upon young minds which are attracted more by flesh and its shameless display than by anything else. Indian students seldom go to the pictures to study the scenario art but they go only to see the love scenes, the scenes of compromising postures and gestures of the two sexes in order to feed their starved sex instinct. There is absolutely no freedom of the sexes in India,

and that Indian youths are so much sex starved, and that is why, they make love to the college or university girls, attend also love-pictures on the screen and also indulge in all sex-perversions in order to fulfil their sex impulses. Even the old men and women of India, and particularly, the labourers in the workshops, mills and factories go to the pictures only to feed their starved sex instinct. They can not afford to go to the brothels, they can not have any approach to any woman in any other sphere, and hence, their only means of satisfying their sex hunger is the cinema !

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I thoroughly approve of what my immediately preceding speaker has said. I want to add a few facts and figures in order to strengthen his position and finally decide to ban cinema to students. Many people—the teachers, the guardians—do not know that Indian students slip away from home from the college or university hostel, from even the class room during study hours, in order to see pictures. Very few people know that students keep albums of the photos of the film stars (female film stars) and also film magazines under their pillow, and instead of reading books for their examination have a look at the album and the magazine in the day or in the night. There are many students who, being excited unduly by such albums and magazines, madly run after girls in the college or in the university or even in the public streets, and sometimes due to such activities they get into serious troubles.

There are students who go far beyond that after having seen some romantic or sexy pictures. They run to the public brothels in order to satisfy their sex hunger and contract some of the incurable venereal diseases ; while a few other students, who are silly and stupid commit self-abuse or sodomy in fits of desperation only to ruin their health prematurely.

It is not merely the romantic or sexy pictures that have their adverse effects upon the student community but the crime pictures, particularly, of the South American gangsters inspire the students to organise such gangs of criminals secretly

and to commit various crimes such as kidnapping, burglary, dacoity, murder etc. just as the most daring and secretive criminals do in all parts of the world. Students first start robbing their parents by breaking open the iron safes of their guardians at home or in their shops; then, they start robbing their college and university treasuries, and last of all, when they become slightly experienced in such crimes, they join other gangs of criminals and lead them in their nefarious activities by means of their superior knowledge of the scientific methods of stealing, burgling, robbing, forging kidnapping, murdering etc. That is how ultimately they turn to be expert criminals or gangsters. In America, it is the students who commit most of the crimes, and that is why, crime stories and crime films have been banned there; but unfortunately, in our country, the film-producers as well as the book-sellers are pushing crime films and crime stories with the greatest enthusiasm in the absence of any opposition from the Government.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I do not agree with the previous speaker that students at all commit any of the crimes as the result of seeing crime pictures or reading stories. They may be sometimes excited by such stories and pictures but they can never go to the length of hatching or commit such crimes giving up their studies, their home life or their college and university career. They may be interested in the detective films or stories because of the ingenuity of the various methods of committing crimes and also of detecting those crimes but nothing beyond them. Students are after all imaginative and adventurous youths who can be inspired by any kind of adventure but surely, I would refuse to believe that they are inspired only by criminal adventures. In my opinion, it is the heroism or rather the daredevilry of the gangsters, the subtle ingenuity of the detectives in tracing out crimes and, even the hot gun duel between the police and the gangsters—all are indeed most inspiring and thrilling things which undoubtedly attract the young heroic and imaginative minds of the students who want to live more in a world of adventures and thrills rather than in a world of peace

and quiet. It is because of this adventurous and heroic spirit in students that they easily fall into the trap of the political leaders, the public agitators and all sorts of trouble-shooters. We find this particular trait of the student community richly illustrated in many of the disturbances in our country in which students take part occasionally. What is happening in China these days? Who are leading the Cultural Revolution? Who are playing so much of havoc or destruction in many of the provinces of China? It is the students alone, and no other element. Mao Tse-tung, the leader or the Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party is a very clever psychologist, and that is why, he is using the students as the cat's paw for strengthening and perpetuating his power or supremacy over the whole of China even after his death. In the same way, we have seen how some of the political party leaders have been misusing students, not for any national or common welfare but for their own advancement only. The students are not interested so much in wrong or evil causes as they are interested in noble and right causes; but then, unfortunately, they are so reckless, thoughtless and impulsive by nature that they can not judge the rightness or the wrongness of a cause when they are excited like the thoughtless mob by the cunning political leaders, otherwise students, generally speaking, have no evil spirit ingrained in them.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, the fourth speaker has merely pointed out to you the evils of crime films, crime stories, and wicked politics but has not exposed the real psychology or the real nature of students. Students, in my opinion, are extremely mischievous and wicked, and being idlers and also being neglected by their guardians and teachers alike, can have possibly nothing to do except hatching mischief. Most people blame the government for not providing any constructive programme of life to the students, while others blame the political leaders, for misguiding the students and instigating them to commit all sorts of disturbances in our country; a few others blame the poor guardians, parents and teachers for neglecting their children or pupils and thereby producing a race of destructive youths and nothing else. But these critics or observers do not care to see

under what environments the students now-a-days are being brought up, and they never care to go to the very root of the student problem. In my honest opinion, it is the cinema, the restaurants, the coffee house, the gambling dens, the drinking stalls, coeducation in the colleges and the universities, crime stories, love stories, and even obscene literature—all are equally responsible for the misguidance and degeneration of the student community in our country ; and therefore, why should we not recommend the banning of all such things in order to save the future leaders, and administrators or legislators of our country ? Cinema must be banned to students, first of all, and then, crime stories and obscene literature must also be banned. Of course, obscene literature is liable to prosecution ; but then, such literature is not sold openly in the market ; and hence, only cinema and crime stories should be banned. So far romantic stories and novels are concerned, they are not so exciting or degenerating, and hence, they need not be banned. If such novels and stories have to be banned, then all kinds of literature, all kinds of commercial advertisements, all kinds of bathing or swimming in semi-nude costumes have to be banned to the women, and even some of their garments have also to be banned ; but that is an impossible game

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, I have carefully listened to the arguments of all the speakers who have gone before me, and after having duly weighed them in my mind, I feel that much injustice would be done to the students if cinema is banned to them. I want to raise one question here on behalf of the students. Do you think, gentlemen, that students are really bad, or are they any way worse than their teachers, guardians or parents ? If not, why should they be deprived of one of the most enjoyable recreations. I mean, cinema ? In my opinion, it is the teachers, the guardians and the parents who are much worse than their pupils, wards and children. The teachers of today are the greatest shirkers of duty ; the parents and the parents of today are most negligent in the matter of looking after their wards and children. The teachers and the guardians or parents attend the cinema, drink wine, gamble and even visit public brothels either secretly or openly ; and after having set such

bad examples before their pupils, wards and children, they want to chastise them (children, wards and pupils) if they (students) go to indulge in such evils or to deliver sermons on self-restraint and self-discipline. What can such chastisements or sermons do unless the guardians and the teachers correct their own wrong ways of living and set better examples of discipline and character ?

Then again, you must be knowing that many of the teachers and most of the guardians initiate their pupils and wards, not only to the pictures but also to drinking and gambling considering such things as fashionable and aristocratic ! And if after this sort of initiation, the students happen to be addicts to some of these vices, should we find fault with the students or with their guardians and teachers ?

Our Government can do only one thing by banning cinema to all. But how will the Government agree to cut down altogether one of the biggest sources of national revenue ? The film industry of India, we are told, is the biggest source of Government revenue just like the excise articles such as wine, opium, hemp etc., and that is one of the chief reasons why, a wise and considerate Government can never afford to enforce universal prohibition or ban completely the film industry. Our Government badly needs money for the various development projects. How can such a needy government afford to ban cinema or enforce prohibition ? U S A. once or twice tried to enforce prohibition but she hopelessly failed in the enforcement because all the wine or alcohol distilleries went underground just as they have gone underground these days in most of the parts of our country wherever prohibition has been enforced. Why, therefore, students alone should be made the black sheep victimised when there are so many other black sheep in various other trades and industries ?

Seventh Speaker

Gentlemen, I am not in favour of inhibition of the fundamental instincts of human nature. If you go to suppress or oppress any of such instincts, it will crop up with full vengeance over and over again like the Hydra heads, and I can assure you

that you can never kill them. You are perfectly aware of the ultra-Puritanism in England, and also of the extreme asceticism in India. Puritanism as well as asceticism led to all sorts of perversion in religion, in morality, in sex-relations. Homosexuality followed Puritanism in England. Tantrism followed asceticism in India. There should be some limit to self-restraint and self-discipline. The best remedy lies in moderation but not in suppression or oppression. All the perversions of human nature follow all kinds of suppression or oppression of the various instincts. In my opinion, instead of completely banning photo-plays to the student community, it would be much wiser to instruct the film producers of our country to produce such pictures which would inspire the youths of India with a heroic spirit, a spirit of adventure, with a love of beauty of Nature which is really dying away from the modern world with the developments of science and industries. I for myself would not like to blame either the Government or any particular section of our population for the moral degeneration of the student community but, on the other hand, I would like to recommend all sorts of ways—means and methods—of ennobling the character of our youths, whether they are students or not; and hence, instead of banning cinema to students I would better warn the teachers, the guardians and the parents to take greater care of their pupils, wards and children while guiding their tastes, views and ways of life.

RESULTS

First speaker	secures	60	out	of	100	marks.
Second Speaker	„	50	„	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	60	„	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	70	„	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	75	„	„	„	„
Seventh Speaker	„	50	„	„	„	„

REVIEW

The first speaker opened the discussion in a proper manner; the second speaker could not follow up the arguments.

with the same tempo although he did not do badly altogether. The third speaker improved upon the second speaker; the fourth speaker also did the same. But the fifth and the sixth speakers did the best considering their psychological and practical view-points. The seventh or the last speaker flagged down because the range of arguments were exhausted by the preceding speakers.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board notices with both pleasure and alarm how much the student community is interested in cinema and other activities of life in which they should not be so keenly interested because according to the Indian ideal of life, the only ideal of students should be nothing but studies—*Chatranang adhyanang tapa*—i.e. the only pursuit or occupation of students should be to read books.

Discussion No. 7

WOULD YOU PREFER COUNTRY LIFE OR TOWN LIFE ? AND WHY ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, I would prefer country life for the following reasons :—

(1) When Goldsmith said that God made the country while man made the town he meant probably two things, namely, that the country side is full of natural beauties and the country people also are most simple and innocent creatures, which means, in other words, that God resides in the countryside where the people are most unconventional and least artificial, where both men and women still retain their primal nature *i.e.* truthfulness, frankness, honesty, naturalness, modesty, innocence, simplicity etc. and where you can find all sorts of beautiful objects of nature such as green fields, trees, plants and flowers, domestic animals such as cows and buffalos that graze on the lawns, various kinds of birds that perch on the branches of the trees and go on twittering; and besides, sometimes, you can find hills or forests bordering on the countryside and lending further beauty to the natural objects all around.

(2) The country people, as I have said, are really godly creatures as compared with the town people because they have love, fellow-feeling, unity, friendliness, sympathy, kindness, generosity none of which you can find among the city people who are selfish, unsympathetic, malicious, jealous, wicked, hypocritical, treacherous, irreligious, immoral and degraded in every possible way.

(3) There is no disease or illness in the rural areas because the air is always fresh and pure like the sunlight, because there is no cesspool, because there is no contamination of the air by the smoke of the chimneys of the workshops, mills and factories. You can see the blue sky, the silver moon, the golden sun, the fleecy clouds and all their loveliness in the countryside because there is no dust or smoke continually enveloping the sky or vitiating the atmosphere. Most of the village people suffer from no disease at all; they are always healthy and strong even in their advanced years, and most of them live a long life.

(4) You can get pure food and drink in the countryside; there is no adulteration of any of the articles of food or drink, and that is why, the rural people rarely suffer from dysentery, typhoid fever, anaemia, tuberculosis, dyspepsia, or any such disease which is generally caused by adulterated food and drink. In the countryside you can get pure milk, pure wheat, pure *ghee*, pure butter, pure oil, and pure everything. You can get also fresh vegetables, fresh meat, fresh fish and fresh milk—all of which keep the body of the country people always healthy and strong.

(5) In the countryside there is no noise of any kind—the whistle of the railway engines, the hooting of the motor cars, motor trucks, motor buses or of any other heavy vehicles which keep plying day and night through all the streets and roads of a town or a city. Then again, in a town you will constantly hear the blare of the mike that goes on howling in order to bring to the notice of the town people some manufactured drug or some industrial commodity or some photoplay or some other essential or non-essential goods for the consumption of man. Even till dead of night you can not have your sleep which is constantly being disturbed by all sorts of noise.

Second Speaker

But, my dear gentlemen, inspite of all the alliments of the countryside, I would always prefer town life for the following reasons :—

(1) Country life is ~~an~~ monotonous and boring. Because

of the sameness and uniformity of the natural scenes as well as of human activities. You have to greet the sight of the same lawns, the cornfields, the cattle and the peasants from day to day and from month to month; and hence, there is no change or novelty about anything in the countryside.

(2) There are so many disadvantages, so many handicaps, so many deficiencies about country life. You have no protection against sun and shower. During the monsoon, the thatched colleges and the mud houses give no shelter to men or to cattle. The countryside is often flooded during the rains when the rivers are in spate and when men, cattle and all human habitations are washed away. Then again, after the floods, there is an epidemic of all sorts of foul diseases such as cholera, dysentery, pox, typhoid fever etc. which take a heavy toll of human lives and the various cattle-heads. In rural areas you can seldom find any qualified doctor or any medical dispensary, and naturally, the victims of diseases have to die a slow and miserable death.

(3) But in the towns or the cities, you have good shelters against the rains; there is no question of any flood invading them or destroying any life or property. You have also plenty of qualified doctors, good clinics, hospitals, nursing homes, medical pharmacies, so that anybody who has got a little money can avoid or avert the various diseases. Epidemics rarely occur in towns or in cities because preventive measures of inoculation or vaccination, cleanliness of the roads and the streets, the gutters and the entire sewerage system, and disinfection of the drinking water and all kinds of food stuff are taken long before any epidemic of cholera, dysentery, pox or typhoid fever can take the chance to break out.

(4) In the present century, man has made such great developments of science and industries that he cannot go without some of the common amenities of life such as electric light and fan, electric heater and cooler, and the common means of transport such as bicycles, motor bikes, scooters, motor cars, motor buses—all of which help the town people a good deal in economising their time and labour and also in contributing to their ease and comfort which one can not

enjoy in the countryside, where one has to go on foot for twenty miles or atmost one can go in a bullock cart with no better pace than walking.

(5) Man can not live by bread alone; he can not continually feed on the beauties of nature alone; he must have some food for his mind which is the greater part of man than his body; and that is why, he needs libraries, schools, colleges, universities, cultural institutes, where he can study books and also compare his thoughts and views with his fellowmen. Man in the modern century can not rest satisfied with his bodily needs only; he has his greater needs of the mind for which there is no food in the countryside at all. And, therefore, how can a modern civilized man live always in the countryside ?

(6) Then again, gentlemen, can you find clubs, playgrounds, swimming pools, cinemas, theatres, dancing halls, restaurants, coffee-houses etc. anywhere in the countryside ? Do you think, man does not need such things ? Do you think, man can be contented by merely smoking tobacco, or by drinking country liquor or by chatting in the malthouse with the co-villagers, or atmost by quarrelling and abusing one another when one has nothing else to do ? How can such life be enviable in any way particularly to a modern man, an educated man, a civilized man ?

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, it is really difficult to choose between country life and town life. The Americans and the Europeans, on the one hand, have been so much fed up with the town life that many of them have now started migrating to the countryside in order to live furthest away from the stir and bustle of the town or the city, while on the other hand, in the backward or under-developed countries, the country people are equally fed up with rural life because of its sameness and uniformity or rather its dullness and monotony due to the absence of the various activities and recreations of modern life. I am undoubtedly a modern educated and cultured man, and I have been bred and brought up all my life in big towns and cities. I often pine for the calm and healthy atmosphere of the countryside

because I can not stand now-a-days too much of noise and activity of town life, which gets on my nerves and ruins the peace or harmony of my mind. I would, therefore, prefer country life to town life, and give further arguments for my preference :—

1. In the town, if you happen to live in the very heart of it, you can not concentrate your mind on anything because of the constant stir and bustle.

2. You can not by any means see, even for a while, any of the green lawns or cornfields or you can not sit on the bank of a stream or a rivulet to listen to the music of the flowing water or to see the lovely ripples on it sometimes ; you cannot see any of the lovely birds or any of the sheep and the lambs, the cows and the buffalos to serve as a change to your eyes as well as to your mind ; you can not enjoy the sight of the pouring rains or of the raging flood when it does not affect your village ; you can not enjoy the company of the most innocent village children, the most unconventional men and women of the countryside ; you can never enjoy such a clear sky, such lovely clouds floating in the sky, and on top of all, such a silver moon—all of which make you feel for a moment that you are one with them.

3. The countryside is the best place for communing with Nature or with God, for composing poems and writing novels and stories and on top of all, for being a philosopher ! In the town or in the city, if you go to do any of these things, you will have to exercise your imagination as well as strain your mind a good deal in order to forget your town environments altogether ; otherwise you will compose a bad poem or no poem at all, write an unnatural novel or story or no novel or story at all.

4. Besides, in the countryside, there is still some love and fellow-feeling among the people who do not try to deceive or cheat or swindle or hold any conspiracy with one another, and this is the best part of country life. There is no formality, no insincerity, no conventionality about the country people, and that alone attracts me towards them just as insincerity, deceitfulness, treachery, callousness of the city people make me run away from them.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, with all the unfavourable aspects of city life, which have been wrongly pointed out by some of my preceding speakers, I would always prefer city life. One of the preceding speakers has unduly beautified or glorified country life, and I want to point out his errors by the following arguments :—

1. The rural people are most uncultured ; they are almost completely illiterate, ignorant and superstitious. No educated or cultured person can find delight in the company of such people.

2. The rural people are most wicked, intriguing and quarrelsome ; they are jealous and malicious too, and hence, they are bereft of love, affection, sympathy or fellow-feeling. They always try to cut the throat of one another. They are always involved in litigations because they can not settle any dispute amicably, and that is why, the lawyers have a flourishing trade in the rural areas.

3. The country people are so boorish and without any sense of modesty and decency that their very words and behaviour are most repulsive to cultured and polished people ; and hence, how can a modern man prefer country life to town life ?

4. If you consider the amenities of life, you can not get anything in the countryside which can lend you comfort or ease. How long can you feed on the green lawns, the corn-fields the river banks, the hills or the forests bordering some of the rural areas. Wherefrom would you get electric light or fan ? How would you travel from one village to another distant village except on foot ? You can enjoy the downpour of rains while sitting in a cosy sheltered house but not in a mud-house or in a thatched cottage that will either melt or leak heavily upon your head !

5. Can you afford to risk your life if you suddenly get an attack of strangulated hernia, appendicitis, some fractured limbs which would require immediate surgical aid ; but wherefrom would you import a surgeon or a doctor ? The village

doctors are illiterate Vaid's and the rural surgeons are barbers ! Would you like to be treated by such quacks ?

6. I am sure, you would like to read newspapers, books and periodicals while staying in the countryside ; but who will import all these reading materials for you ? Not surely, any Alladin's Lamp !

7. To whom will you talk about Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Shaw, Milton, Eliot and other great men of letters ? To boobies, who have rarely heard of anybody else in the world except the village Pundit who has read probably upto class seven or eight ? With whom will you discuss the Sputniks, the astronauts, the soft landing on the moon ? To calves and lambs, sheep and buffalos, bulls and cows or to their masters who are no better than they ? That is why, I say, country life would be absolutely intolerable for an educated and cultured man.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, the fourth speaker has most unjustly underrated or undermined country life in order to give you a totally false impression about country life, and thereby indirectly to prove that town life is indeed most enviable. But please patiently listen to my arguments which will atonce remove your prejudice in favour of town life and prejudice against country life :—

1. Undoubtedly, in towns and cities, you have many of the modern amenities of life ; but have you ever considered what price you pay for them, and how many of the town people or city people actually enjoy those amenities ? Have you noticed the stark demarcation between the well-built houses in respectable localities and the slum houses in the labour colonies ? And there is a third section of the town people, namely, the clerks, the schoolmasters and others who get starving wages from their offices. Have you noticed how they live, what amenities of modern life they enjoy, how wretchedly they suffer in health in the dark and dingy lanes of

the town or the city, and how they pass their life with their wife and children.

2. What attraction can the cinemas, restaurants, coffee-houses and other places of public recreation have for the poor labourers, the clerks, the schoolmasters and the peons or the *chaprasis*, when they can not have even two square meals a day ?

3. Some of my honourable friends here have said that there are good doctors, surgeons, clinics and hospitals in towns and cities which are seldom found in the rural areas. That is perfectly true ; but who can afford to engage these doctors or surgeons ? Who can buy such costly drugs from the pharmacies or the druggists and the chemists ? Just as in the villages, the lawyers suck the very blood of the country people by involving them into litigations throughout the year so also the doctors and the physicians in the towns and the cities suck the blood of the patients and ultimately kill them !

4. One of the speakers said just now that an educated and cultured man can not find delight in the company of the illiterate country people. But what sort of people are those who live in the towns and the cities ? They are the worst specimens of humanity. In the first instance, they are liars and swindlers ; in the second instance, they are first class hypocrits ; in the third instance, they are spiritually and morally most degraded ; and that is probably the chief reason why they can not feel interest in the company of the country people who are just like gods before the city people !

5. Gentlemen, do you talk of education, culture and all that ? What is education or culture worth if there is no moral character ? Do you mean to say that the city people have better moral character than that of the country people ? I am afraid, nobody will agree with you unless one is blind or himself a town-dweller.

6. It is not only the town-dwellers who are the counterfeit specimens of humanity but there is nothing else in the towns and the cities except corruption and adulteration. Can

you find a single man or woman of character in any of the towns or the cities ? Can you get any pure milk, pure butter, pure *ghee*, pure wheat, or even pure spices which you daily consume as your food ? Are you not swallowing poison from day to day and thereby shortening your life ? You can not find so much of corruption and impurity in men or in the consumer goods of the rural areas. Which, therefore, would you prefer—town life or country life ?

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, who would like to vote for town life after so much of valid arguments, so much of facts and figures against town life ? I would better be an illiterate, uneducated and uncultured man all my life and live in mud-houses and under thatched roofs, and also suffer all the inclemencies of weather during the monsoon or the blazing summer or the biting winter than agree to live in towns and cities for the temptation of the modern amenities of life particularly when I know that like the millions of my fellowmen I cannot afford to buy or secure these articles of comfort and luxury and also when I know that by dwelling too long in towns or cities I shall have my health perfectly ruined and also my soul morally and spiritually degenerated.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50 out of 100 marks
Second Speaker		50 „ „
Third Speaker		50 „ „
Fourth Speaker		40 „ „
Fifth Speaker		40 „ „
Sixth Speaker		20 „ „

REVIEW

All the speakers have equally done well except the last speaker who for want of arguments had to conclude the discussion abruptly. But then, the arguments put forward by each of the speakers are all patent arguments, and hence, there is no originality about them. It appears that the candidates are

sharply divided between two groups—town-dwellers and country people. But then, some who have been bred and brought up in the towns and the cities appear to be fed up with town life and hence they are inclined to country life, while others who have been living in the countryside from generation to generation feel attracted towards town or city life probably because of the latest amenities of life invented or manufactured by science and industries.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board notices with pleasure that there is a tendency among some of the young people to turn to the countryside. India is a country of villages and the villages badly require a great uplift and improvement. The Community Project of the Government of India was a move in the right direction but unfortunately, it has not so far succeeded in its aim probably because of the mishandling of the project. The Board wishes that all Indian youths of today, who are foolishly attracted by city life, should begin to settle down in the villages and try their best to improve village life.

Discussion No. 8

DO YOU THINK, ANGLO-INDIAN SCHOOLS TURN OUT BETTER STUDENTS THAN INDIAN SCHOOLS ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, if Anglo-Indian schools do not turn out better students, how could all the most highly educated people, how all the most cultured and aristocratic people, how all the most highly placed persons in Government or private services could agree to send their children to such schools for their education and up-bringing ?

As a matter of fact, the Anglo-Indian schools are run by English, American and other European Christian missions whose only noble aim is to do service as well as to bring light to the helpless and ignorant masses not only in India but in all backward countries particularly in the Far East. These schools are manned by highly qualified teachers who are graduates from some of the European or American Universities and who as such are much better scholars than most of the Indian graduates and post-graduates of our own universities.

The Anglo-Indian schools undoubtedly teach better English than most of the Indian schools because most of the teachers in Indian schools are weak in English as even some of the professors in the Degree Colleges and universities are woefully deficient in English because they too have been educated in Indian schools and taught by Indian teachers whose mother-tongue is not English.

On top of all, Anglo-Indian schools teach far better manners than most of the Indian schools. Students of these schools are made to observe better discipline, greater punctuality and regularity in their work and behaviour than any of the most reputed Indian Schools. The reason is that the teachers of Indian Schools are themselves without any sense of punctuality, regularity or manners ; how can, therefore, their pupils develop any sense of discipline or manners ?

On top of all, the method of teaching in Anglo-Indian schools is much better and more scientific than that followed in Indian schools, and that is the chief reason why. Anglo-Indian schools turn out much better students than Indian schools.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I can assure you that those who are enamoured of English education and western culture are prejudiced against Indian schools and in favour of Anglo-Indian schools. Honestly speaking, no Anglo-Indian school produces better scholars or students than some of the well-reputed Indian schools. Is it not a fact, Sirs that the scholars who top the list of the successful candidates at the High School or Intermediate Examinations do not belong to any of the Anglo-Indian schools ? It is by the results of the scholars we have to judge the merits of the schools to which they belong.

I am afraid, gentlemen, people attach much greater importance to English than to any other subject, and because the students of Anglo-Indian schools can speak or write English more fluently and sometimes more correctly too than the students of Indian schools, people generally have the wrong opinion that Anglo-Indian school students are better in all respects than the Indian school students. Even in the matter of writing English, Anglo-Indian school students are no better than the Indian school boys and girls because both write wrong and bad English. The only difference lies probably in the fact that Anglo-Indian school boys and girls can speak English more fluently than the Indian school boys and girls simply because Anglo-Indian schools follow English as the medium of teaching, and otherwise too, they insist the students

always to speak in English to their teachers as well as to their school fellows. If Indian schools had followed the same custom or the same habit, their students also could have spoken English as fluently or correctly as any body else. But we should judge students not merely by their proficiency in English but by their achievements in other subjects also.

It is a wrong idea that Anglo-Indian school boys are far more well-behaved than the Indian school boys. Indian school boys may not be knowing some of the English manners but that should not take away from them the credit of knowing their own native manners. Would you like to make any difference between English and Indian greetings such as good morning, good evening, good night etc and *namaste, namaskar*, etc. ? Would you like to draw a line of demarcation between Indian politeness or courtesy and Anglo-Indian politeness or courtesy ? If you do, I am afraid, you will be doing injustice to Indian culture, Indian civilization and Indian tradition.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, may I like to know from you the definition of a good student, or should I define it myself on your behalf ? In my opinion, a good student is an all-rounder in studies, sports and manners. Now, please place one Anglo-Indian school student side by side with one Indian school student. What difference do you notice between the two ? Don't you think, the Anglo-Indian school boy is much more smart and polished, much more shrewd and intelligent, much more active and quick, much more decent in talks, gestures, gait and movements than the Indian school boy ?

Whenever students of both the types of schools appear before a Selection Board, it is the Anglo-Indian school boys who snatch away the laurels at every interview because they are very smart and quick in their replies to questions put by the Selection Board. You can see for yourselves, gentlemen, whenever any procession is taken out through the streets of our country by the school students, don't you notice that the Anglo-Indian school boys do their parade much more smartly

and gracefully than the Indian school boys. Even in the playgrounds or in the sports contests, do you not find the Anglo-Indian school boys making a far better performance in most of the games and sports than the Indian school boys ; and therefore, would you not consider the Anglo-Indian school boys better than Indian school boys in many respects ?

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am afraid, every body seems to be prejudiced in favour of Anglo-Indian school students simply because of our slave mentality or rather our inferiority complex developed by English education and Western culture. If we just drop English dress, English manners, English medium of teaching and conversation, we will find that Anglo-Indian school students are no better than Indian school students in any respect. It is the outward show that catches the eyes of most people who never care to look deeply inwards and who, therefore, miss some of the sterling qualities of the Indian school boys. How obedient, how serviceable, how polite, how sympathetic, how considerate, how generous, how self-sacrificing the Indian school boys appear to be when they are compared with the Anglo-Indian school boys who are rude and rough and even vulgar and indecent at school as well as at home. Have you not noticed what sort of filthy, dirty and vulgar expressions they use while talking to their own school or class mates ? Is it because the teachers in the Anglo-Indian schools are not well-bred or because they belong to the mixed-breed section of the Indian population or because the students themselves of such schools belong to low-born families or mixed-breed species ?

Indian school boys are definitely far more well-behaved and far more decent in their manners although they may not be as polished or smart in their dress or as artificial in their manners as the Anglo-Indian school boys. But would you prefer artificiality to genuineness, dross to purity, tinsel to gold ?

Just consider for a moment, gentlemen, how the Anglo-Indian schools make a fool of the guardians and the parents of

the children who are sent to such schools for their education. Everybody knows what exorbitant tuition fees are charged by these schools from the kindergarten to the high school classes, and what do they give in return? Nothing but third rate teaching and scholarship and the worst form of manners; and yet most of the foolish Indian parents send their children to such schools only to make them snobs or misfits in their national life or even in their domestic and social life.

It is interesting to note in this connection that those who profess to be the champions of the Hindi language and also of Indian culture and of the Indian National Congress send their children to the Anglo-Indian schools, not because they will turn out to be better students but because they will put on the English costume discarding their native dress, because they will speak Anglo-Indian English at home as well as in public, because they will pretend to be superior to their own countrymen, because they will pretend to forget their own mother-tongue and, even for all practical purposes, they will disown their own relatives and their countrymen who hate to learn the English language, hate to speak in English, hate to put on the English dress. Don't you think, such school boys would be completely lost to their nation? Have you not heard many of the Anglo-Indian school boys often declaring that their native land is not India but England? There are many such Indians in our country who take pride in pretending to be Englishmen although their complexion may be as good as the Cobra boot polish!

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am afraid, some of my preceding speakers have spoken beside the mark—some being carried off their feet by their infatuation for the English language, English culture and English ways of living. It is no fault of Indians alone but as a matter of fact the whole of the Eastern world is infatuated by the English language, English dress, English manners and English culture. Just look at the Japanese and the Chinese, the Cambodians, the Indonesians, the Malaysians, and even most of the Africans who have started receiving the light of English education. Do you not find them to be much greater patrons

of these Anglo-Indian, Anglo-Chinese, Anglo-Japanese, Anglo-African schools, and why? Because of the magnetism of whatever is English, whatever is European, or whatever is Western. The Eastern people never go to judge men and things by their intrinsic value at all; rather they are invariably guided by the outward show, and that is why, with all the faults of English culture and education, the whole of the Eastern world has become a slave to English culture, English ways of life, English language, English dress, English education and English everything!

But, gentlemen, we are all Indians here—whether we are speakers or listeners. Why should we be prejudiced against our own educational institutions, our own culture, our own mother tongue, our own native dress and native ways of life? Why should we unjustly believe that Anglo-Indian school students are better than Indian school students particularly when we know that now-a-days, the boys, the girls, the teachers of the two types of institution are all *pukka* Indians, born of the same soil and of the same stock—either Dravidian or Aryan or Mongolian, and the qualifications of the teachers are also the same, either second class or third class graduates or post-graduates of Indian universities! In my honest opinion, the average student of an Indian school is definitely a better scholar than the average student of an Anglo-Indian school. I do not think, I am under-estimating or over-estimating anybody. But it is the common weakness of the Indian mind to over-estimate anything to which the name 'English' is attached. So, it is not at all surprising to me that many people are misguided by the very name of 'Anglo-Indian School'; they forget that the students and the teachers are all *pukka* Indians although two or three decades ago, there used to be some European element in these institutions due to which, the Anglo-Indian schools used to have a better look and possibly better teaching and better students. But now-a-days, both the types of schools being equally rotten can not turn out good students at all! Recently, a conference of the heads of all Anglo-Indian schools in India was held at Lucknow, it is striking to note that most of the heads of these schools flattered or rather posed themselves to be Englishmen and boastfully said that Anglo-Indian

schools maintain a much better standard of teaching, and hence, turn out much better students than the Indian schools ! Fortunately, there was no head of any of the Indian schools in that conference ; otherwise the lambs would have been all shorn of their wolf's skin !

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, practically, every body has spoken in favour of Indian schools and their students but none seems to have pointed out any of their actual merits, probably because they possess no merits at all ! Look at the personality of the boys of Indian schools ! They can not walk with their head erect ; they can not look at anybody straight in the face ; they have not got the courage or the readiness of mind to any question promptly ; they are exceedingly shy,—should I say, timid and cowardly, probably because they feel guilty at heart without committing any offence; they have no smartness about anything—either about their dress or about their manner of speaking or behaving on any occasion. What is the cause of all this ? Probably the teachers in Indian schools do not teach their pupils how to develop their personality, how to cultivate courage and forwardness, how to be smart in dress and speech and manners. How can you ignore all these disqualifications or deficiencies while judging them as students ? A student does not mean only a scholar or one proficient in his studies or in learning but good or smart or proficient in everything. When the boys of both Anglo-Indian and Indian schools go for a commission in the Armed Forces, it is invariably the boys of the Anglo-Indian schools who are selected and very seldom any boy of an Indian school is selected, any why ? Because in the Armed Forces, it is the qualities of leadership and not mere scholarship which is counted ; and it is a fact that those who possess less of scholarship and more of leadership turn out to be better officers in the Armed Forces.

If you visit any of the Indian schools during its working hours, what do you find there ? Nothing but noise, confusion, and indiscipline. But just have a look at any of the Anglo-Indian schools during its working hours. You will find there,

first of all, a pin-drop silence, and then, all work and no talk ; and the whole atmosphere appears to be one of perfect discipline and harmony. Do you mean to say, all this difference between the two types of schools in discipline and atmosphere will make no difference between their boys ?

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures 60 out of 100 marks				
Second Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„

REVIEW

Almost all the speakers have done equally well; and it is, therefore, difficult to judge them separately. Most of the arguments put forward by the speakers are quite sound and convincing ; but those who have defended the Anglo-Indian school boys have had to face much stiffer opponents than the opposite camp has had to do. On the whole, the discussion is interesting particularly from the psychological point of view—how Indians are still wavering between Indian culture and English culture, between the English language and the Hindi language, between a slave mentality and a free mentality !

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has nothing to comment except to congratulate the speakers that the discussion has been carried on without any prejudice or malice. The Board fears that the topic for discussion touches the delicate field of racialism, and hence, it recommends that such topics should not be discussed in future by the candidates who appear before the Services Selection Board for a Commission in the Armed Forces. The Board further congratulates the young speakers that they exercised considerable restraint upon their tongue while holding the discussion so freely and so boldly.

Discussion No. 9

SHOULD PROHIBITION BE ENFORCED BY LEGISLATION OR NOT ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, I am definitely in favour of Prohibition to be enforced by legislation. I am offering the following arguments in defence of my position :—

1. Drinking wine brings very little pleasure to the drinker ; it causes only a kind of intoxication which makes one unconscious of his surroundings ; or in other words, which makes him forget or rather drown his worries or anxieties for the time being but which brings back again the full consciousness of them all with vengeance *i e* with much greater bitterness or pain than before drinking

2. Drinking causes much of poverty to persons who have a lean income as most of the labourers, clerks, school masters and members of other trades and professions generally have.

3. Drinking leads to crimes. As a matter of fact, most of the robbers, thieves, burglars, poisoners, murderers and other criminals are in the habit of indulging in drinks. They drink much of wine, first of all, to urge them on to the commission of the foul crimes, and then to forget the pinches of their conscience as well as the fear of the police and the penalties of law which invariably follow all sorts of crimes.

4. Nothing noble has been ever performed or achieved

by drunkards; on the other hand, all the capabilities of achieving greatness are killed by the alcohol habit, not in a day but slowly and gradually because alcohol has an undermining effect upon both the mental and physical faculties. Many promising careers have been ruined by the drink habit. If the leaders of our country or of any other country would not have been addicted to wine, they could have solved quite amicably and successfully some of the knotty national and international problems of the world.

5. Many people probably do not know that the liquor industry employs the smallest number of labourers and yet it fetches the largest income ; which means that by the liquor industry the capitalists exploit the labourers to the highest degree. Then again, most people probably do not know that liquor is produced by the destruction or rather decomposition of a very large quantity of food stuff such as barley, wheat, rice etc. ; and hence, the liquor industry is the greatest enemy to the people who have to face food famine from year to year due to drought and other causes of the failure of crops.

6. You know quite well that alcohol is neither a food nor a stimulant : *e.* vitalising agent ; on the other hand, it is a regular poison and it invariably helps to devitalise the human body and also to cripple the human mind. A drunkard loses the power of concentration, determination, courage, judgment, decision, and hence, the drink habit makes one slowly and gradually an absolutely unfit worker for any job. If you take the statistics of the drunkards and the teetotallers, you will find that it is the teetotallers who are most efficient workers whereas the drunkards are most inefficient workers.

7. Most people probably do not know that the addicts to alcohol lose rapidly their power of resistance during any kind of illness because their body is already devitalised by constant drinking. Most ignorant people think that every kind of wine is nothing but grape juice, and as such, it must be invigorating and highly healthy ; but the actual fact is that except brandy or *vinum galicia*, no other wine is made of grape juice ; and hence, no wine can be invigorating to the body in any sense.

8. Lastly, I want to point out to you all, and you must be knowing it also, that once you contract the habit of drinking, you can never give it up. As a matter of fact, no bad habit can be easily given up just as every good habit can be easily forgotten or given up. Then again, the most vicious aspect of the drink habit is this that you have got to increase the measure of the drink day by day just as you have got to do the same in the case of opium eating or drinking or smoking.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I can not agree with the first speaker on many points particularly when he has pointed out the evils of alcoholism or the drinking habit. Drinking serves as a source of exhilaration, a means of forgetfulness, and also as an instrument of inspiration. How many people in the world have forgotten their deepest sorrows by drinking wine ! How many, after hard work, have derived a mighty relief from wine ! And how many indeed under the inspiration of wine have performed great feats, and how many have possibly failed to do so for want of wine !

If drinking were really an evil how could millions of people in the Eastern and the Western world indulge in drinking inspite of all sermons from the priests or all warnings from the physicians ?

It is absolutely wrong to say that all foul criminals are drunkards. There are many robbers, dacoits, burglars, murderers who rarely have touched wine in their life ; and hence, there is absolutely no connection between crimes and alcoholism.

It is not at all true that all mean and ignoble things have been done under the influence of wine. On the other hand, read the lives of the great poets, great artists, great novelists and dramatists of the world, and see for yourselves how wine served as a source of inspiration to them all for producing masterpieces of literature and art. Some of the races that have strictly avoided alcohol, as the Arabs have done in accordance with the strict injunction of Prophet Mohammad against wine, have been able to produce nothing remarkable in their life.

The wine industry does not merely destroy or consume much of human food stuff but it helps to produce many useful things (by-products) for agricultural and other purposes. If the first speaker wants to accuse the wine industry of exploiting labour, he should accuse more vehemently all the other industries which no less exploit labour in all parts of the world.

It is wrong to believe that moderate drinking is harmful ; on the other hand, it is beneficial to the weaker constitution that requires extra vitality to whip up his nerves or buoy up his spirit. Invalids are advised by the physicians to take egg fillip, which consists of egg and wine, and which tones up broken down health and devitalised limbs due to some of the exhausting diseases during a long period of illness

Every drinker does not necessarily get drunken with wine. There must be some pathological reason for such drunkenness in certain cases, which if inhibited by censure, can lead to much graver tendencies in the person concerned that may urge him to commit heinous crimes ! Would you like to inhibit drunkenness in such cases ? Surely not, if you look to the welfare of the victim of such drunkenness.

We are now-a-days living in a democratic world, and if we really believe in freedom of speech, thought and action, why should we grudge any person his drinking habit from which he might be deriving a good deal of comfort or consolation or inspiration or even bodily thrills which every body needs when one is over-worked, over-taxed, over-worried, by both physical and mental labour. The Government should be the last person to pass any law in order to enforce prohibition because that would be really against all principles of democracy.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, the first speaker has already given good many arguments in favour of prohibition. I want to add to them the following arguments so that the Government may be inclined to enforce prohibition by legislation, because in a country like India, nothing can be achieved without enforcing

it by legislation :—

1. The Government should interfere with individual liberty even in a democratic country if it finds that individual liberty leads to the abuse of freedom and corrupts society and undermines the morality, the peace and harmony of a community. I need not quote concrete instances of alcoholism which you, gentlemen, also must have noticed in your own circle or community or life-time and which has led to a lot of married unhappiness causing even divorce and separation, which has further created much of disorderliness or indiscipline in social or public life, and which has set bad examples of human conduct before one's own children and other younger generations.

2. It is absolutely wrong to believe that the suppression of one evil will lead to the creation of other evils *e.g.* suppression of the drink habit may lead to the indulgence in the worse evils of gambling, swindling, forgery and many other vices and crimes.

3. It is wrong also to believe that sudden giving up of the alcohol habit may lead to certain constitutional diseases such as asthma, tuberculosis etc. Medical opinion does not corroborate this erroneous notion about alcoholism.

4. Many people say that prohibition has not been a success in U.S.A. How can it be a success in India ? They point out that when prohibition is enforced, alcoholism goes underground with the connivance of the very agents of law; and so, what is the good of enforcing prohibition by legislation when the drink habit can not be altogether abolished ?

5. Some people fear that the Parliament of our country will not pass the law of prohibition partly because most of the working class as well as of the capitalist class can not go without drinking, and chiefly because prohibition will lead to a heavy loss of Government revenue which is collected mainly through alcohol industry and film industry. If there be any minority of the members of the Parliament who may vote for prohibition, the majority will refuse to be ruled by minority.

But then, we should know that in all democratic countries it is the minority that rules the majority although such a fact appears to be contradictory in terms.

6 I would refuse to believe that the Government of any country in the world, and least of all, our Government can afford to degenerate our nation by encouraging alcoholism for the sake of national economy. In my opinion, it is better to sacrifice some of the development projects rather than to encourage alcoholism for collecting profits either out of the alcohol industry or out of the film industry—both of which have been seriously degrading our national character in many ways. Nobody can deny that India is a very poor country, the average income per *capita* per day does not possibly exceed twelve annas in the case of men, and eight annas in the case of women. Just consider how such a country can afford to indulge in alcoholism for no fun except of ruining one's bodily health and degrading one's character in the eyes of all.

(7) Last of all, we should consider the climate of our country. Americans and Europeans drink wine chiefly to keep themselves warm particularly in winter; otherwise they can not possibly do any work or even keep themselves alive in the freezing cold. But in India the climate is throughout hot or damp, and very rarely cold except for a couple of months in the lands lying at the foot of the Himalayan mountains. Naturally, if in hot climate we indulge in drinking wine, our body will be all the more enervated, and we will become absolutely unfit for any kind of hard work. Alcohol literally consumes the body if it is taken in Summer; and it develops various diseases if it is taken during the Monsoons. Hence alcohol is not a suitable drink for our country in any part of the year.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, you have listened to the arguments in favour of prohibition but now please consider some of my arguments against prohibition :—

1. If smoking cigarettes or opium or hemp or any other

far more injurious drug than ~~an~~ 'can be permitted in our country why should alcohol alone be prohibited ?

2. Indians suffer from various diseases which are never brought about alcoholism e.g malaria, cholera, typhoid fever, tuberculosis etc. Many other diseases are caused, not by drinking wine but by universal poverty and mal-nutrition, because very few of us in India can have two square meals a day leaving aside the question of other vitaminous foods or drinks

3. Alcoholism has nothing to do with character. When the most civilized nations of the world are drinking wine vigorously, have they lost their character any way either in their own eyes or in the eyes of the world at large ?

4. If the drink habit leads to drunkenness, debauchery, and other vices or crimes, why should the Armed Forces and the Civil Administration be allowed at all to drink alcohol ?

5. In my opinion, it is only two classes of people in our country who take to drinking ; they are the richest class and the poorest class. The richest class indulges in drinking for pleasure while the poorest class does it in order to forget its sorrows and miseries. Why should we deprive the one class of its pleasure and the other class of its forgetfulness ?

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, drinking is definitely a vice, and all human vices must be curbed or eradicated otherwise what would be the difference between the human species and the animal species ? Human beings are distinguished from the lower creations by their power of self-control and self-discipline. The aim of human life is and should be to subdue the lower instincts. If a man cannot conquer his anger or jealousy or malice or cruelty or intemperance, how can he claim his superiority over birds and beasts or over other lower creations ?

Alcoholism is a weakness of the body, and it can be conquered only by the mind. There is no vice which can not be conquered or eradicated by the strength of mind or b

determination or by the will power. If man can conquer the smoking habit, the gambling habit and so many other evil habits, why should he not be able to conquer the drinking habit also ? Why should not prohibition be voluntary instead of being enforced by legislation ?

In my opinion, if we can correct the social conditions and also improve the economic condition, if we can educate the ignorant masses about the evils of drinking wine as we generally do in connection with the morals of the children, why should we not be able to turn the minds of the masses from alcoholism ? We should better work upon the soul and not so much upon the body of man, and it is only then, prohibition can be voluntary.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, I want to know from you why prohibition should not be enforced by law when prevention of all sorts of crimes, when gambling, trafficking in women, and even when divorce, monogamy, and prevention of begging etc. can be enforced by law. Every evil, in my opinion, should be prevented or eradicated by law because otherwise human nature is so much prone to evil ways and evil things that by moral sermons alone, nobody can cure any of the vices or evil habits.

The parents, the teachers, the priests—all warn children and adults not to tell lies, not to steal others' property, not to do any injury to anybody ; and yet, my dear gentlemen, how many of them listen to the advice or the warning of these venerable well-wishers ? Most of the children and adults do tell lies, do try to do all sorts of injury to others, and even commit many of the crimes such as cheating, swindling etc. inspite of all warnings and advice from the elders. That is why, in every country, law has to intervene by awarding punishments to all kinds of offenders and thereby reduce or put a stop to the crimes which would have otherwise grown like wild weeds in such profusion that it would have been impossible for the peace-loving men to live in the world. Therefore, gentlemen, I am strongly in favour of the enforcement of prohibition by law.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	75	out	of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	70	„	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	65	„	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	50	„	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	30	„	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	40	„	„	„	„

REVIEW

The first speaker has done very well ; he has put forward good many arguments in defence of Prohibition. The second speaker also has done almost equally well. The third speaker has defended nicely the legal side of prohibition, while the fourth speaker has offered a few but sound arguments against prohibition. The fifth speaker and the sixth speaker have done the worst in the discussion probably because all the good arguments, for or against the proposition, have been exhausted, and naturally, nothing new can be said in the matter.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board is highly impressed by the arguments of some of the speakers, whether for or against the proposition. The Board further wonders how so many arguments could be put forward both for and against the proposition, because the topic for discussion is not so controversial as it appears to be. The Board is strongly of opinion that prohibition should be strictly enforced by legislation, and it is expected that majority of the legislation of our country will vote for it.

Discussion No. 10

CAN ARMAMENT STOP WAR ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, Gandhi used to say that violence breeds violence, hatred breeds hatred, and that there is no end to violence or hatred. Armament stands for violence ; it is an expression of hatred ; and hence, if we use armament for neutralising violence or hatred, we will not succeed in establishing peace or friendliness. Therefore, I am strongly of opinion that armament can never stop war.

We should consider also one important point in connection with armament, namely, that there can not be any end to armaments. When Russia started inventing some of the nuclear weapons just two decades ago in order to guard herself against U.S.A., which is a capitalist country, while Russia is a communist country, and as such, both are deadly antagonistic to each other, U.S.A. also started manufacturing all sorts of nuclear weapons so that she would be able to counter the attack if Russia made any unprovoked aggression upon U.S.A. But what is the result of all this race in armamentation? Both Russia and U.S.A. have invested most of their capital in building up armaments, and Russia being comparatively a much poorer country than U.S.A. has become practically bankrupt in finances, otherwise why most of her development projects have been so far kept in abeyance, and why, her agriculture particularly has been having a serious set-back atleast for the last five years, and why U.S.A. inspite of her unlimited wealth has stopped altogether or cut

down many of her aid programmes for the under-developed countries in the Far East ?

That armament breeds war has been clearly demonstrated by U.S.A. who created armed conflicts between North and South Korea and who is still keeping alive the great conflict between North Viet-Nam and South Viet-Nam. Although U.S.A. has wasted many billions or trillions of dollars on the Viet-Nam conflicts yet she does not appear to have been exhausted at all ; she is probably preparing for a conflict with China or with Russia ! That is why, I say that armament has not only no end but it breeds greater hatred and violence slowly and gradually.

It is, ofcourse, wealth which makes armament possible ; otherwise a poor country can not afford to build up any armament even in self-defence. When China struck India once and Pakistan struck her (India) twice, India's economy and her development projects were very much dislocated and seriously suffered ; India, after having met these three unprovoked conflicts, had to invest huge amounts of her capital in strengthening her defences ; she has not as yet gone in for nuclear armament simply because she can not afford, like Russia and U.S.A., such an expensive programme, and also probably because she does not like any kind of nuclear proliferation. I am, therefore, strongly in favour of disarmament.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, it is simply impossible to maintain national existence without armament. I am sure that it is due to the hot race in armamentation between Russia and U.S.A. that the third World War (nuclear or otherwise) is being prevented. I am of opinion that one should be sufficiently strong to defend oneself against any stronger enemy or atleast against one's nearest neighbours.

What Gandhi has said may be psychologically true but that does not mean that we should keep ourselves defenceless or at the mercy of any prospective enemy. We should know that there are two kinds of leading instincts in man—lust for

wealth and lust for power ; there is also a third instinct *i.e.* the quarrelling instinct or the fighting instinct which is no less strong than the lust for wealth or the lust for power. When a country is greedy of wealth, she always tries to bring under her control whichever country would make her wealthy as the Britishers came to India two hundred years ago as traders, not with any intention of ruling over us but with the express purpose of looting us, exploiting all our resources and making Britain wealthy. But when Britain became sufficiently wealthy, she became greedy of power too, and hence, she carried on her campaign of colonialism all over the world by means of her armament, especially, her navy. If India and other British Colonies had sufficiently strong armaments at their back, could Britain ever dare set her foot on any of them and suck their blood for centuries ? Certainly not. That is why, I believe in armament *i.e.* in meeting force with force, violence with violence, hatred with hatred, and cruelty with cruelty.

Third Speaker

But, my dear gentlemen, I am strongly in favour of disarmament for the following reasons :—

1. If all the nations were disarmed, how could they make any aggression upon one another even if they wanted to quarrel and fight, even if they wanted to acquire wealth and power at the expense of other nations ?

2. Disarmament makes a ferocious beast an absolutely harmless creature when he is denuded of his teeth and claws (corresponding to the destructive weapons of war). If Pakistan were not armed by Britain and America, could she ever dare make such an unprovoked aggression as she did in 1948 and 1965 ? If China were not provided with arms and ammunition by Russia, could she ever dare attack India, or could she make any preparation for an attack on Russia in the near or distant future ?

- (3) Any kind of weapon is considered as an instrument of Satan or the devil who constantly instigates the possessor of such an instrument to poke everybody else, to fight with anybody without any justifiable cause. Therefore, every nation

should be armless. Why does not the government of even a free country does not allow even her free citizens to possess arms without any license ? Because arms themselves egg their possessor to seek quarrels and fight with others without any cause.

(4) If you injure a person without any justifiable cause, he can never forget the injury, and therefore, whenever he will possess some arms and also feel strong enough to hit you back, he will do so without fail. That is the law of justice or retribution—*lex talionis* or the law of eye for eye and tooth for tooth—which is found in all living creatures. This law is probably based upon the most fundamental law of self-preservation without which all species of creation would have slowly and gradually become extinct.

(5) It is not Gandhi's or Christ's belief but it is my belief too, that nobody can hate you if you love him, that nobody can hit you if you do not hit him. Similarly, if nobody possesses the instrument, of hatred or violent *i.e.*, armament, nobody can hit anybody, and hence, nobody would ever think of hitting back anybody.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, those who are in favour of disarmament do not probably think of the problem, namely, how to be completely disarmed while its neighbours are partially armed, how to be perfectly safe. Then again, most people forget that when there was practically no armament at all in the ancient world, did not tribes, clans, sects, races and even countries fight with one another ? They did because the fighting instinct is ingrained in all human beings—in all nations. We may boast of our civilization, light, culture, education, and yet you have seen in your life-time two most destructive World Wars.

Then again, there are various causes of war such as greed for wealth and power, growing population, food shortage or famine, trade and industries, scientific developments etc. None of these causes has anything to do with armament. Why

did China struck India in 1962 ? Because her explosive population is hungry both for land and food. Why is U.S A. striking Viet-Nam for the last two years or so ? Because she wants to exploit the wealth and power of these islands in South East Asia in order chiefly to offset the growing power of Chinese or even Russian Communism.

Sometimes the question of prestige or honour is also involved, and it leads to war whether you are sufficiently armed or not. When Pakistan challenges the cession of Kashmir to India, it becomes a question of prestige and honour with India, and naturally, if Pakistan uses arms at the same time to support her challenge, there is no other alternative left for India to vindicate her position except by meeting arms with arms. Hence, I do not know how you can avoid armament in this world of rivalry, competition, jealousy, ambition, greed, and consequently, how you can avoid war.

In my honest opinion, nothing can stop war. If you have no teeth, you will scratch with nails ; if you have no nails, you will kick with your arms and legs. That is how man satisfies his primitive instinct, which inspite of all culture and civilization, has not lost its virulence.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, one of the speakers has said that if we do not have armament we can not have any war. But that is absolutely wrong. How did the primitive fight ? Had they guns or rifles ? Had they bombers and fighters ? Had they battle-cruisers or submarines ? Had they interballistic missiles ? Had they any atom bomb or hydrogen bomb ? Nothing of the kind ; and yet you know how the Christians carried on their holy crusades against the Saracens or the infidels (Muslims) for decades. Our ancient forefathers used to fight with the bow and the arrow, with the battle-axe, the lance or the spear. But our most primitive forefathers used to fight with stones hurling them with slings. They used to fight battles or wars even without any modern armament.

If you talk of civilization and culture as restraints upon the fighting instinct of man, I am afraid, you are wrong be-

cause you have seen with your eyes in the present century two World Wars which were waged by all civilized countries like Germany, Russia, France, Britain, Italy, America and Japan. There are various reasons why war can never be stopped whether you have armament or disarmament. Please note some of my arguments which will prove that armament alone is not the cause of war, and armament alone can not stop war :—

1. In ancient days, religion used to be the cause of war. People in those days were far worse fanatics than they are now. The crusade was a religious war. Many battles were fought in England between the Puritans (Roman Catholics) and the Protestants. India was partitioned on the communal basis simply because Hindus and Muslims fought with one another on religious ground. Even the Sunnis and the Shias—two sects of Islam frequently fight with each other on religious grounds.

2 Disparity in civilization is often the cause of war. Even these days all the nations are not equally civilized ; and naturally, those who are scientifically or industrially more advanced than others try to take undue advantage of the less advanced countries by overpowering them first by brute force and then by exploiting them in every possible way. All the most progressive countries of today are exploiting the backward countries.

3. There is also a good deal of disparity in commercial and economic developments between various nations or countries. Those nations which are wealthier than others take advantage of the less wealthy nations ; but how ? Wealth commands everything—science and industries, armament, trade and commerce, political supremacy—all of which help the wealthier nations further in growing wealthier and more powerful by exploiting the various resources of the comparatively poorer countries.

4. Every nation says openly that she wants peace and she believes in disarmament but every nation secretly or openly strengthens her armament not only in self-defence but also for aggression upon the less defended nations whenever there is an opportunity for it.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, armament or disarmament can never stop war because there is no limit to armamentation, and also because armament inspires jealousy, rivalry, competition—all of which ultimately breed war between nations. It is absolutely wrong to think that horrors of war can prevent war. It is still more wrong to believe that nuclear weapons are a great deterrent in the production of war. The nuclear powers may not fight with other nuclear powers but they will certainly fight with the non-nuclear nations as U S A is now fighting and playing havoc in Viet-Nam

Some people say that equalisation of world's wealth among all countries can probably stop war but that is also wrong because all the nations can never be equally rich or equally poor. There will be always some degree of difference in this respect between countries. It is on this basis—equalisation of world's wealth—that the communists and the capitalists are fighting with each other. When there is no equality anywhere in this universe, how can there be equality of wealth in the human world.

That is why, I have been convinced by Gandhi's formula of non-violence as the only way to world peace. But then, how can all the nations, all the countries, all the peoples, all the races of the world be made to believe in non-violence when the brute element is always in every human being? How can all human beings be so self-disciplined that they will do no injury even when they are justly provoked? If after so many centuries of light and culture, not even the most cultured nation has been able to forget hatred, violence, cruelty, jealousy, enmity, how can the least cultured nations be expected to remain perfectly cool even when they are outraged? But then, although non-violence appears to be almost an impracticable solution to the problem of war yet this is the only means of sobering the brute in man, the only method of bringing the human race to the realisation of the fact that wars have been repeatedly fought at certain intervals in every part of the world and yet no peace or harmony could be established thereby, and hence, if we practise love instead of hatred, cooperation instead

of disunion, friendliness instead of enmity, we can possibly some day or other bring about permanent peace or harmony in the world.

Seventh Speaker

Gentlemen, armament is absolutely necessary in a world of tooth and claws. How are you going to free yourselves from the shackles of slavery or from the tentacles of exploitation? How are you going to secure your food and cloth and shelter if you are a starved nation, a naked nation, a shelterless nation particularly when you will find that in your very face, before your very eyes other countries and nations are enjoying plenty of food and cloth and indulging in all sorts of comfort and luxury? Would you not try to snatch from them at least the barest necessities of life? This means war. Armament is necessary for protecting as well as for snatching away food and cloth and other articles from the hands of others. In such cases, Gandhi's non-violence would totally fail as it has failed everywhere. You may say that Gandhi got the independence of India without firing a single shot from the locker. No, that is not true. Those who have noticed in Bengal and Punjab the heavy bloodshed which both the Hindus and the Muslims committed on themselves alone can certify that India's independence was not won by non-violence. Even while Gandhi was alive and when India had not been partitioned, did not the Hindus and the Muslims fight with one another? What was the effect of Gandhi's sermons of non-violence upon them who were all Indians? What better effect can you expect of non-violence on other races and other countries who have never heard of non-violence, who have had no experience of the lessons of non-violence or *Satyagraha*, and who had never believed in such a creed particularly when they found in human history nothing but violence prevailing, whether overpowering or being overpowered by violence.

Some people fondly believe that violence nor non-violence can stop war but it is the world organisation like the U.N.O. that can help in establishing peace whether one believes in armament or in disarmament. But in my opinion, the U.N.O. is an impotent Organisation; it has not stopped war at all but

it has merely made a fool of the smaller nations by offering them a false hope of security, stability and also development progress. Britain and America in this respect have been the greatest betrayers of the U.N.O. Charter which they have honoured only when it suited their convenience and not otherwise. Is the U.N.O. interfering with U.S.A.'s uncalled-for intervention in the domestic affairs of Viet-Nam ?

Eighth Speaker

Gentlemen, in the heat of discussion we seem to have forgotten our original problem, namely, can armament stop war ? In one word, I can answer, it cannot, nor can war be stopped by any other means. In spite of civilization, in spite of light and culture, in spite of high education in most parts of the world, have we been able to stop war or even put a dead stop to armament in any country ? Every country has been building up its armament most vigorously, and many of the wealthy and scientifically advanced countries are trying to build up their nuclear armament and nuclear power. But when all nations will be armed to the teeth with nuclear or conventional weapons, do you mean to say that they will never use these weapons against any country ? I am not an optimist or even a dreamer or a fool to believe that man will totally forget his brute instincts simply out of fear of the horrors of war or out of any humanitarian consideration. Man is at bottom a beast, and hence, to expect of him to be humane is really absurd particularly when till today the most enlightened nations are forgetting all their humanity and playing havoc with the life and property of their fellowmen. Even our own country which has been following non-violence in every sphere says now-a-days, "We are for peace but we are ready for war." Whether war is justifiable or not, nobody considers it ; but everybody rushes to fire his gun at anybody whoever challenges his integrity or even when anybody refuses to surrender his liberty or any other property to the highway man ! That is how and why war begins, and how and why it is repeated in spite of the lessons or horrors of war. Has Britain learnt any lesson from Dunkirk, or U.S.A. has learnt any thing from Pearl Harbour or even Japan has learnt any lesson from

Nagasaki and Hiroshima ? If they had learnt any lesson at all they would not have been ready with their guns over the Suez Canal or they would not have wasted so much of gunpowder in Korea, Hungary, Laos or the Congo, or even a petty State like Pakistan would not have tried to rape Kashmir twice !

War will go on for ever, whether you have armament or disarmament, whether you preach violence or non-violence, whether you are the followers of Christ or of Buddha, whether you are educated or illiterate, whether you are rich or poor, whether you are armed to the teeth or completely defenceless, whether you are a Communist or a Capitalist, whether you are an atheist or a believer in God.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	75	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	50	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	65	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Seventh Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Eighth Speaker	„	30	„	„	„

REVIEW

The first speaker and the fifth speaker alone have given arguments to the point while others seem to have been misled by the proposition which they have taken as if war can ever be stopped. It is only the last speaker who has made his discussion too short probably because he comes last of all. On the whole, the discussion has proved to be quite lively and interesting. Even Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence has been put to the test.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board notices with pleasure that quite a good number of candidates have taken part in the discussion. It seems that the youths of today believe more in war than in peace, and that is why, most of them have advocated armament which is an instrument of violence. Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence does not seem to be honoured in his own country otherwise good many candidates would have advocated non-violence instead of violence, love instead of hatred, peace instead of war.

Discussion No. 11

SHOULD THE DISEASED AND THE CRIPPLED BE ALLOWED TO LIVE OR NOT ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, I wonder why such a question be raised at all. In my opinion, every body should be allowed to live as long as he does not die. Man is not the creator of man although he may claim to be his procreator; and hence, what right has he to put to the sword all the crippled and the diseased creatures particularly when they have done no injury to him ?

Why should not man try to make the crippled able-bodied and the diseased wholesome ? If we put to the sword the diseased and the disabled bodies, why should suicide be regarded as punishable by law ? If man can take the life of another man why should he not be permitted to take his own life in order to put an end to all his sorrows and miseries ?

No human being can recommend a mass-scale destruction of the diseased and the crippled. Which parents or which husband and wife or which brother or sister or which children would ever permit their own kith and kin, their nearest and dearest ones to be snatched away from their bosom in order to be killed for nothing. Do you mean to say, a father or a mother would allow their dear child, diseased or crippled, to be snatched away from their bosom and to be destroyed ? Do you not find how children who are born blind, deaf, dumb, insane and with hands and legs all paralysed or absolutely

stunted in growth are loved all the more by their parents ? How can you, therefore dare destroy such 'darlings' of the parents without causing a mass revolt in the country ?

I put you one pertinent question, gentlemen,—who has made certain persons healthy and strong while others diseased and crippled ? Has man made them as such or is it all Nature's work ? If it is Nature's work, let Nature herself weed out the crippled and the diseased by her own process of selection as she always does in order to preserve the species. Why should man interfere with Nature's process or law ? What have the diseased and the crippled done to you that you should grudge their very existence on earth ? Do you mean to say, you will remain perfectly healthy and strong till your death, or you will not get any of your limbs—the arms or the legs, the eyes or the ears—crippled some day by some mischance or accident ? When you fall ill, do you not take the help of doctors or physicians in order to recover from your illness, or do you really commit suicide in despair that you will never come round from your illness ? If you do not commit suicide, why should you kill another like yourself who is unfortunately born blind or deaf or dumbs or insane or crippled in the arms or in the legs ?

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I am afraid, the First Speaker has totally misunderstood the real significance of the proposition for our discussion, which poses the question—whether the diseased and the crippled should not be helped in putting an end to their useless or miserable existence by putting them all to the sword. May I ask you, gentlemen, what benefit these crippled and diseased creatures serve to human society or to their nation ? Instead of serving any benefit, they merely hang as a heavy burden upon society and the nation. It is, therefore, better that they should be removed from the world to reduce the burden of society as well as to put an end to the sufferings of the handicapped themselves.

Do you think, gentlemen, that the seriously handicapped souls feel any way happy in their heart of hearts ? Does not

a blind man curse his own star, his parents, his God and everybody in this world when he cannot walk a single step or do anything without the help of somebody else, or when he feels that he is being deprived of all the beauties of the universe, that this golden universe of the sun, the moon and the stars, the rivers, the mountains and the valleys, the birds, animals and human beings is nothing but an eternal mass of impenetrable darkness? He sometimes feels like committing suicide so that he may be reborn with his full eye-sight to see the glories of this universe or the beauties of Nature on earth. And besides, like that great blind poet Milton every blind man feels most rebuked at heart that he can not do any service either to himself or to others with the light of his eyes denied to him from his very birth. In the same way, a deaf or a dumb person feels very much vexed or wounded at heart that he cannot hear any sweet music either of human voices or of the birds or of the murmuring stream, that he can not communicate his feelings, thoughts and ideas with any of his fellowmen. A diseased person, while groaning or howling with pain in his bed from day to day and from month to month, feels like committing suicide particularly because he cannot bear the bodily pain or because he fears that he will have to keep lying in bed for ever and will not be able to move about or do anything else like others. Ofcourse, an insane person does not feel what he is, and therefore, however much the world may pity him, he appears to be the happiest soul on earth.

After having seen all the wretchedness of the life of the crippled and the diseased, who would like them to continue their existence on earth—an existence of pain and suffering and uselessness? In my opinion, in order to make a healthy and strong nation, we should completely weed out the weak, the crippled, the diseased, the handicapped, the disabled and the crippled. Such creatures as the blind, the deaf, the dumb and the diseased are often found in India to get married and thereby to multiply their race of cripples. This should not be allowed if we want national health, national strength and national welfare. The Nazis and the Communists do not believe in preserving any race of cripples, by feeding them, by taking care of them, by treating them with medicine. But India is a strange

country ; it preserves the race of beggars, of fakirs and all sorts of religious mendicants, and the Jains go further still in their humanitarianism—they preserve very carefully the bugs and the lice, the mice and the rats and all sorts of obnoxious and destructive vermin. Mahatma Gandhi belonged to the race of the Jains, and that is why, he believed so much in non-violence or *ahimsa* ; he could never have the heart to kill even a fly or a mosquito ! Whatever might be views of Mahatma Gandhi, we are not all *Mahatmas*, and hence, we judge men and things only by their practical utility and not by any humanitarian point of view.

When I think of the crippled and the diseased people of our country I get scared to think what a great burden these crippled creatures are upon our national economy. Just as the Landlords, Zamindars, Taluqdars and even the native princes were nothing but parasites upon our population and their government, so also sometimes I feel that the diseased and the crippled creatures of our country are no better than parasites ; and hence, they should also be extirpated root and branch like the Zamindars, Landlords, Taluqdars and native princes !

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, Milton, the great blind poet, has said, "Those also serve who only stand and wait", which means that even the crippled and the handicapped people also can be serviceable to the world. In many parts of the progressive world and even in our own country many schools and training centres have been opened in order to educate, train and equip the blind, the deaf and the dumb so that they may be serviceable to society and earn their livelihood independently. So far the diseased are concerned, all diseases are not incurable, and besides, the diseased of any country are not any national liability or burden but they are the responsibilities of individual families, and as such, whether the diseased die or live, suffer for a short or a long time, whether they are crippled by their diseases permanently or temporarily, whether they can earn their living or not, is no concern of the State ; and hence, I do not see any reason why, any body except the guardians of the

diseased should bother about them ; consequently, nobody—neither the State nor the Society—has any right to extirpate the whole race of the diseased and the cripple on any ostensible excuse.

Then again, in most of the progressive countries, and even in our own country, many hospitals, asylums, clinics, nursing-homes have been built up for the relief of the diseased and the crippled. These establishments are financed mostly by private endowments and sometimes also by the Government. Nobody in any country uptill now has ever thought of extirpating the race of the diseased and the crippled out of fear that they are a great burden on the national economy of a country.

I want to know from you, gentlemen, why you should not extirpate the whole race of beggars, *fakirs*, *sadhus*, and religious mendicants, who are not only idlers and vagabonds by themselves but who are also a great drainage upon the charity of our populations as well as upon our national economy ; and you should instead propose to extirpate the most innocent and helpless souls like the diseased and the crippled when you know quite well that they are dependent upon their own parents or other guardians and not upon the State or the people at large ?

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I believe in the law of the survival of the fittest ; and you will surely agree with me that the crippled and the diseased are not surely the fittest to survive. I, therefore, recommend the wholesale killing of such handicapped creatures on the following grounds :—

1. Those who cannot earn their own livelihood independently of others, have no right to exist.

2. Those who are victims of foul diseases help only to spread the contagion of such diseases to healthy bodies and thereby make them crippled too.

- 3 The diseased and the crippled will be of no service to their country in the event of any foreign aggression.

4. If the diseased and the crippled marry as they often do, they will be only multiplying the race of the diseased and the crippled.

5. A diseased or a crippled person has a life of pain and suffering, and sometimes, he himself wants to put an end to his life with his own hand ; and so, why should not the crippled and the diseased be helped in their self-destruction ?

6. You know, gentlemen, how poor our country is and how limited is the income of a middle class family. If one member only becomes an invalid for a year or so, he becomes a heavy drainage upon the family purse ; and if such a person is likely to remain an invalid for an indefinite period, is it not advisable to remove him altogether from this world and relieve him also of his bodily and mental suffering ?

7. How many hospitals, clinics, nursing homes and asylums can be built or maintained by private endowments if the number of invalids and cripples goes on multiplying as it has been multiplying with the growth of our population ?

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I cannot appreciate the arguments of any of the speakers who advocate the destruction of the diseased and the crippled. Just look at the work done or being done by the UNESCO, UNICEF and WHO that have been looking after the diseased and the crippled all over the world. Do you think, these world organisations are all fools in trying to preserve the crippled and the diseased ? With the advancement of science, they are trying to use their advanced knowledge of science for the service and welfare of the human race. But some of my friends here, on the other hand, propose to kill their fellowmen on no ostensible plea ! There are many other methods of helping the diseased and the crippled, many other ways of checking the growth of population or the spread of contagious of foul diseases than by killing them outright !

Then again, it has been found out that some of the diseased and crippled persons possess certain extraordinary

gifts either in art or in literature or in philosophy or even in science. Would it not be wise to preserve such crippled or diseased or handicapped souls with the greatest care so that they may be encouraged to contribute their talents to the service or advancement or glory and pride of the human race?

Besides, the number of the diseased and the crippled is not very large as compared with the total population of the earth. Why should not such a negligible number be suffered to exist and given a chance of proving to be serviceable to society and the State some day or other?

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, we should remember one great lesson *i.e.* one who is not born diseased or crippled may at any moment become so, as in our daily life all over the world we come across innumerable cases of healthy young men and women suddenly becoming blind due to an attack of pox, or becoming insane due to an attack of typhoid fever, or becoming badly injured in the arms or in the legs by some accident so much so that they become absolutely useless for any kind of work. Would you propose to kill such persons as soon as they become crippled or diseased? Then, I am afraid, practically the whole of the human race has to be extirpated some day or other because all will by turns contract some foul disease or become crippled in any of their vital limbs during childhood, boyhood, youth or old age.

In primitive days when the leader of a tribe used to grow weak and became unfit for the task of protecting his tribesmen against any other tribe, he used to be killed outright, and another strong leader used to be installed in his place. Some of the aborigines in India and elsewhere had the custom of killing their own parents when they grew old because they ceased to be serviceable to the family or became a burden to the family. The spirit of the primitive man seems to be still lingering in the modern man when he recommends that the diseased and the crippled should be done away with. But such a spirit is not in harmony with the phenomenal development of the human mind in all directions in the present century. Even the law of natural selection should not be

applied to the human species particularly when the human species has advanced so far in science and performing miracles in every field. The various drugs which have been invented so far and also the science of surgery has made such a great progress that even the most incurable diseases are now-a-days being cured, and the most crippled persons are made able-bodied; and hence, there is absolutely no need of worrying about the diseased and the crippled, what to speak of extirpating them.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	75	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	50	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	40	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	40	„	„	„

REVIEW

It appears that only the second speaker has done the best, while the fifth speaker and the sixth speaker have made a poor performance. The rest of the speakers have done tolerably because every one's arguments are quite logical and also sufficiently convincing.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The proposition itself is a very strange one as viewed by the Services Selection Board but it is none the less interesting because of the arguments put forward by some of the speakers. The Board believes that such proposition can not draw any decisive conclusion, and hence, it is rather difficult to declare which party is right and which party is wrong. But then, it is certain that nobody of any common sense or of any milk of human kindness would ever recommend the killing of the diseased or the crippled.

Discussion No. 12

WHO IS THE BETTER MAN—A SOLDIER OR A HANGMAN ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, I should like to know first in which sense "better man" is used. Is it used in the sense of "nobler man" or "more serviceable man" or "more efficient man"? In whichever sense "better man" may be used, a soldier is definitely a better man than a hangman. A soldier is admired and adored everywhere but a hangman is hated and abhorred by every body, and why? Because a soldier is a patriot, because he is courageous, because he risks his life in the battlefield, because he kills the enemy of his country and saves the honour and integrity of his motherland, because he does not serve the army for money. But a hangman is absolutely a mercenary creature, who kills the convicts mechanically *i.e.* without any sentiment. But a soldier is inspired by some patriotic feeling, by his love for his motherland. A hangman is callous, brutish, mechanical and without the least touch of any sentiment.

Then again, a soldier has to undergo so much of hardship. He has to fly in the air, ford through deepest jungles, climb up many dangerous rocks and also sometimes dive into water. He has to face all kinds of risks, chiefly the risk of his life every moment. But a hangman has nothing else to do except to raise the axe and chop the head of the convict or hang him on the gallows or put him in the electric chair or put the head of the convict between the two blades of the guillotine.

He is absolutely a hireling, a mercenary creature, and has to undertake no pains for his job. He is just like a butcher who too is a better man than a hangman in the sense that he kills lambs, goats and sheep to supply meat to all who are meat-eaters. A butcher is not a mercenary hand but is a businessman—a trader in animal flesh but a hangman merely kills the convicts who have been condemned to death by the courts of law, and hence, a hangman has nothing to do with the past or the future of the condemned ; he is merely concerned with his own job—the job of killing on the orders or decree of the court.

A soldier experiences all kinds of thrills whether working in the trenches or fighting from the bombers or from the submarines, which no hangman can experience because, as I have said, his job is a mechanical job with no skill or strategy or tactics about it. But a soldier has to learn so many things—the secrets of all kinds of weapons of war—from the old conventional weapons to the nuclear weapons. A soldier can never be compared with a hangman because a soldier is infinitely superior to a hangman in every respect. A hangman has no intelligence, no brains, no skill—nothing of the kind but a soldier has to possess all these qualities if he wants to be a good or efficient soldier. On top of all, a soldier is a human being while a hangman is no better than a machine !

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, whatever my preceding speaker has said about the hangman or the soldier is all wrong. A hangman is not such a despicable creature as my friend thinks him to be. He does real service to society by killing the condemned criminals. The hangman bears no ill-will, no hatred, no enmity towards any body except those who are most heinous criminals whom he actually removes from the world in order to meet the ends of justice. His job is the noblest in the sense that he helps the authorities of law and justice in ridding human society of all the foul and undesirable elements just as the scavenger does it by cleansing the roads and the streets, the dark and dingy lanes and the gutters, of all the foul refuse, filth and dirt of the towns and the cities.

The hangman kills nobody with any malice as a soldier does. A soldier is as much a hireling as a hangman ; and he kills with some kind of ill-will towards the enemy whom he kills, and you know that his ill-will has no justification. Can any country in the world justify any war unless, ofcourse, it is an unprovoked aggression upon her in order either to subjugate her or to plunder her ; otherwise can any soldier justify his killing ? He kills persons practically in cold blood, and that is why, he is a great coward although the stupid world calls him a patriot, a great hero ! But wherein does his heroism lie ? Does he like the hangman relieve the society of the pests and pestilences, the knaves and the scoundrels ? Certainly not. In my honest opinion, the world unjustly glorifies the action of a soldier who is as much a mercenary as a hangman. Does not a soldier join the army in order to feed his stomach ? What else is his motive ? And hence, how can you say that his motive is noble and his action is also noble ?

In my honest opinion, there is no nobleness about the soldier's profession, but on the other hand, his profession creates a horror or rather a loathsome feeling in the mind or heart of every body. Can any body forget the horrors of the First World War of 1914 or of the Second World War of 1939, particularly, the devastations which were worked in Poland, at Dunkirk, in London, in Pearl Harbour, and in Heroshima and Nagasaki.

A soldier does not now a-days kill merely one person in the battle-field, as he used to do with the battle-axe or with the spear or with the sword or even with the bow and the arrow ; he kills hundreds of people at one and the same time, with any latest missile of destruction as the American soldier did from the air by throwing one single atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and thereby killing atleast half a million of people in a few seconds ! Then again, even killing one person in the battle-field means making destitute one family of several members of the deceased. Now-a-days, a soldier kills not soldiers but civilians of the enemy country who are absolutely innocent and defenceless too. Would you like to call such killing a heroic, a noble action from any point of view ?

A hangman, on the other hand, does a great service to

the society or to his country by removing the foul characters who would otherwise create nothing but unrest, disturbance, discord, and lawlessness. The hangman performs the same salutary function as the police constable who catches the thief or encounters the dacoit and kills him with the gun. But what does a soldier do except killing with no justification at all. Is there any justification for war, for armament, for maintaining the armed forces? The most ostensible plea of the soldier is self-defence or defence of his country in the event of an unprovoked aggression. But that cannot be any justification at all because even an unprovoked war can be stopped by negotiations or parleys.

It is wrong to believe that a soldier is loved, honoured and even adored by every body. In the modern world, after having seen two most destructive wars, everybody has developed a great abhorrence for the soldier's profession. Bernard Shaw in his play—*The Arms and the Man*—has caricatured the soldier and his profession. The modern world holds the soldier with the same scant regard if not with positive detestation. Every body knows how brutally the soldier kills the innocent defenceless civilians, and particularly the women and the children. It is the height of cowardice to lay any hand upon women and children but the brute soldiers rape mercilessly the women of a conquered country and also kill most brutally its defenceless children. How can you call such creatures as heroes or brave creatures? It was only in earlier centuries that soldiering used to be considered as a noble or heroic profession but now-a-days it is being treated as the profession of cowards because formerly every soldier had to fight hand to hand and without playing any trick with his opponent but now-a-days, the whole warfare business has become a trade of strategy, camouflage and foul play. Hence, I say that the days of chivalry are gone, and in their place have come the days of cheating, deceiving, betraying and playing all sorts of foul tricks which the human brain can possibly invent. Who can be proud of such deceitful and treacherous deeds? The hangman has no such tricks about his trade; he offers no excuse for his killing; he merely executes the routine work of doing away with the condemned criminals who have been awarded the

capital punishment for the commission of some of the most heinous crimes.

A soldier is as much a mechanical instrument of destruction or killing as a hangman. A soldier kills a man because he is ordered to do so. A hangman also kills the condemned simply because he is ordered to do so otherwise he has no initiative of his own.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, a soldier is definitely a better man than a hangman. He is not altogether bereft of feelings but a hangman is just like a block of wood or stone ;— he has no heart, no mind, no brain—nothing of the kind. A hangman often drinks probably to forget his heinous job of killing persons in cold blood. He does not know anything about the condemned criminals whom he kills, and naturally, none of his feelings—pity, sympathy or indignation—is aroused before performing his act ; but a soldier is throughout inspired by some noble feeling or sentiment, namely that he is going to risk his life for a noble cause—the cause of the defence of his country. He is also inspired by the feeling of heroism or bravery for which he is awarded various trophies—rank, ribbons and colours. But a hangman is nowhere in the world awarded any such token of honour or glory for his action. How, therefore, can you compare a hangman with a soldier ? There can not be absolutely any comparison between the two.

Besides, a soldier possesses so many good qualities—of discipline, orderliness, obedience, skill, courage, readiness of mind, fore-thought, judgment, precision and so many other things which go to the making of a good soldier. But a hangman need not and does not possess any of the above qualities because his job is a blind job, because he performs his task from day to day with closed eyes.

If a soldier takes a wrong step it can ruin the whole battalion or the whole regiment or even the country which is being defended by him. If Napoleon had not proceeded against Russia in the deepest winter he would not have lost the game.

Hitler too committed the greatest error of hitting Russia at the back, and that is why, after having conquered practically the whole of Europe lost it again so quickly and had to quit the world himself ! A soldier's job is, therefore, a very responsible job like the job of the Finance Minister or rather of the Planning Minister.

A soldier who rises from the common rank and file to the position of a Commander-in-Chief is not an ordinary person. He must be possessing all the qualities of a great leader like the President or the Prime Minister of a great Republic. But any illiterate man, a blockhead, an idiot or a fool can be a hangman because his job is merely to hit the nail on the head. Ofcourse, the hands of a hangman must be steady and his nerves also must be made of iron ; otherwise how can he chop unerringly so many human heads ?

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, Tennyson has said, 'Where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise'. This is very true in the case of the hangman who does not even know what he does by chopping the head of the condemned, but the soldier's job is not such a blissful job. Every moment, during the operations, he is aware of what he is doing, how he is doing and why he is doing ; and hence, a soldier's job requires the greatest training as it involves the greatest training and discipline. You or I or anybody else can be a hangman provided we have brawny arms, a callous heart and a head with no brains *i.e.* a perfect blockhead. But any and everybody cannot be a soldier. That is why, so many boys, otherwise quite brilliant, are rejected by the Services Selection Board. A soldier requires now-a-days specialisation in so many things—not merely in physical strength and courage.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	60	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	"	75	"	"	"
Third Speaker	"	50	"	"	"
Fourth Speaker	"	20	"	"	"

REVIEW

The Second Speaker has done the best because he has defended the indefensible. Nobody can defend the case of a hangman against that of a soldier, and yet the second speaker had it most creditably. The first speaker has defended the case of a soldier no less creditably than the second speaker has done the case of a hangman. The third speaker is a fall down from the first speaker and the second speaker while the fourth speaker has cut the sorriest figure because all the arguments have been exhausted by the preceding speakers.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board is of opinion that the proposition for group discussion here is not a happy proposition because the very idea of any comparison between a hangman and a soldier is an odd comparison. Except in the killing job there cannot be any other point of comparison between the two. And yet it is remarkable that one of the speakers has marvellously defended case of a hangman and also has proved his superiority over a soldier. In all ages and in all parts of the world, the hangman has been detested, while the soldier has been honoured and adored.

Discussion No. 13

SHOULD STUDENTS BE ADMITTED TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN ORDER OF MERIT ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, it is only when there is a scarcity of schools and colleges and when there is an over-abundance of students seeking admission to these institutions it is but natural that some strictness has to be observed in the matter of admission ; otherwise good students, due to their lack of personal influence and also due to their bad economic condition, may miss altogether the chance of admission to schools or colleges, whereas bad students because of their personal influence and also good financial condition would enter the portals of the educational institutions and thereby degrade the standard of education and also lower the intellectual level of the scholars—none of which is conducive to the welfare of a nation and hence, should not be encouraged particularly in a backward country like India where the percentage of literacy as well as the intellectual standard are equally low.

I am, therefore, strongly in favour of admitting students to schools and colleges in order of merit so that the best students should be able to come up for higher education and finally become the leaders of country either as administrators or as legislators.

Then again, education should not be so cheap in the sense that it should be available to every Tom, Dick and Harry or to Ram, Sham and Yadu. There should be some kind of measure or standard or yard-stick by which we should be able

to judge the merit of each individual boy. Ofcourse, examination result is one form of measure ; interview is another kind of test ; and sometimes a pre-admission test, both written and oral, can be used in order to discover the real merits or talents of the scholars who want to go in for higher education. If we admit both good and bad boys, the institutions will produce more of bad boys than of good boys, and slowly and gradually, the intellect of the scholars, the standard of teaching; and everything will deteriorate so much that it will be difficult afterwards to arrest the degeneration or to give any impetus to any kind of improvement. Naturally, after a decade or so, our country will be all full of third rate scholars who will make nothing but third rate citizens and third rate administrators or legislators. Therefore, I am strongly in favour of admitting only the first-rate students and rejecting most of the third-rate scholars. As in contagious diseases so also in the matter of education, weak and deficient scholars will invariably breed a race of third rate scholars and leaders which will weaken our nation in every sphere—in the sphere of science or industries, trade or commerce, economy or defence. Who would desire such a national degeneration? None except a fool or a traitor.

In most of the leading or progressive countries, particularly, of Europe and America, we find rigid tests are being applied everywhere, not only in the matter of admission to schools and colleges but also in the matter of employment in the offices, workshops, factories, mills or all sorts of establishments wherever there is some scope for employment. That is the only reason why these countries have made such rapid progress in all fields while some of the Oriental countries like India and China are so backward in every respect.

I still hold the view that education should be made so cheap as it has been made in our country. All the students—good or bad,—whoever come to seek admission should not be admitted to the educational institutions without any discrimination. If we do as we have been doing so far, our educational institutions would be merely the haunts of the dregs of our country, and consequently, there will be no good teachers,

physicians, lawyers, administrators, legislators, technicians, city-builders or even good businessmen who too require good commercial brains ; there will also be a fall of the educational standards—of teaching, of text books, of training or equipment of any kind for scientific, technological or industrial development.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, who does not want the best of scholars, the best of teachers, the best of leaders etc ? But do you mean to say that if you merely restrict admission in the schools and the colleges, you will be able to produce better men for your country ? Certainly not. It has been found out that each profession or trade or occupation requires a special talent or qualification which has nothing to do with the general attainments of a scholar. For example, one who secures very high marks in most of the subjects at the High School or the Intermediate Examination may not necessarily turn out to be a good business executive or a good lawyer or an efficient administrator or legislator.

Then again, if we do not admit all students to schools and colleges without any discrimination, how can the percentage of education increase in a country like India where even the percentage of literacy is as low as twenty, whereas in other countries it is as high as sixty, seventy, eighty and ninety ? In my opinion, nobody should be barred from education upto any stage, because I know that after the completion of education, all will have to enter a new sphere where the real struggle will begin and where many of the best or worst scholars will be weeded out, and it is only the “fittest” who will survive this struggle.

Gentlemen, how would you judge the merits of a boy or a girl while admitting them to a school or a college ? Would you judge them by the marks they secure at the various examinations or would you put them to any *viva voce* test, or have you discovered any other way of measuring the merits of a prospective magistrate or judge, or governor or Minister or Prime Minister or President ? It has been found out that

many of the third divisioners in the long run turn out to be better administrators or legislators than the first-divisioners. If you just have a look at the academic qualifications of the various Ministers of the States or of the Union including those of the Prime Minister, do you find that they are all graduates or post-graduates and that they had ever been brilliant students in their educational career? Some of them are Matriculates or even below that, and yet look at their capabilities as leaders, administrators or legislators. Do you think that even the most brilliant post-graduates or doctorates can match some of these matriculate or non-matriculate Ministers in their capabilities? If not, why should we put a bar at the very beginning of a man's career on earth by restricting admission in the schools and the colleges. Ofcourse, I would not mind if you restrict admission at the post graduate stage because education at the highest stage should not be too common or cheap, as it has become in our country with the result that the post graduates of our universities are not equal even to the matriculates of any of the European or American universities. This is rather sad and shameful. But then, we should not deprive anybody of our country of the minimum standard of education *i.e.* graduation, and hence, restriction on admission in the schools and the colleges would be indeed doing cruelty to the teeming millions who aspire to be educated

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, if we go to judge the merits of a boy or a girl by their examination results, we shall be misled because in my opinion written or oral examination is not the best method of discovering real merits or capabilities; and when we have not found out any other better method of measuring merits, we shall have to depend upon it for the time being. You must be knowing, gentlemen, how much of scope there is for unfair means in the examination hall, how much for favouritism in the hand of the examiner, and how much of uncertainties and risks lies at the time of answering questions—all of which determine the results at any examination—university or competitive examination. Naturally, certain candidates in spite of their real merits go down in their examination results

while others who are inferior to them go up in the same scale. Would it be, therefore, fair to adopt such a whimsical standard while admitting students to the educational institutions? I am afraid, such a method of selection would seal up the fate of many of the deserving boys and girls of our country.

Honestly speaking, what are the first divisioners of our schools and colleges and even of our universities? They are mere book-worms; They make a selection of certain questions which are expected at the final examination; they merely mug up the answers to them, and vomit them in their answer books, and that is how they secure first class marks in each of their papers. Some of these first divisioners get intimate with some of their university professors who are paper setters and examiners. They get broad hints about the particular questions which are expected, and by preparing these questions alone they secure first class marks; and while awarding marks too, some of the examiners show favouritism to some of their pet boys and award them first class marks. That is how most of the undeserving boys get at the top of their examination results without having either any depth of knowledge or any brilliant intelligence; and that is why, when you have a talk with some of the first divisioners of our universities, you find that they are not really very sharp or quick in intelligence or sound and deep in knowledge

Fourth Speaker.

Gentlemen, have you ever considered the problem how you would be able to provide for the education of all if you go to admit all kinds of students to schools, colleges and universities? Has our country sufficient means to build up a good number of well-equipped educational institutions? The rate at which education is expanding in our country, it is indeed very difficult to cope with it. When we go to visit some of the schools and colleges in our country do we find them any way better than the ancient *pathsalas* or primary schools. How poor is the building, how ill-equipped with furniture are the class-rooms! How ill-equipped are the libraries and the laboratories! Sometimes these are no hostels,

no playgrounds, no libraries—nothing of the kind in some of the High Schools and Intermediate Colleges; and yet they have hundreds and thousands of scholars on the roll. Very often, there is a shortage of teachers each of whom teaches more than three or four subjects and is overworked too. How can there be efficient teaching under such a system? And yet we find that every year hundreds of students pass out of these institutions, most of whom, of course, are third divisioners, who get into the Degree Colleges or the Universities and thereby add to the number of weak, bad or indifferent scholars.

Then again, you have not considered as yet one of the most vital problems of our educational institutions, namely, the problem of discipline or orderliness. Why there is so much of unrest or indiscipline now-a-days in our educational institutions? The chief cause is the unusual number of students in every school or college; and the next cause is that most of these students are third-rate students, who, as such, instead of being serious about their studies are always on the lookout of some kind of mischief *i.e.* some agitation or movement, some revolt or unrest, some indiscipline or disorderliness just to keep them busy because they always want to enjoy some fun or other even at the cost of their own future career. Such students are always the source of all sorts of trouble in the educational institutions as well as in public because they play easily into the hands of some of the wicked political leaders who instigate them to create further mischief for the government by destroying public property and by creating all sorts of hooliganism, vandalism or goondaism in the country. Just look at Red China's Cultural Revolution. What is this but an instigated revolt of the school students who are creating all sorts of chaos and confusion to serve only the selfish programme of consolidating or perpetuating the power of Mao Tse-tung, the dictator of Red China. Similarly, in our country too, some of the wicked leaders of some of the political parties incite or instigate the third-rate students of the schools, colleges and universities to lead some kind of agitation and create some kind of disturbance or confusion which has no connection with education or student welfare.

That is why, I say, that such students, who are not at all seriously inclined to studies, must not be admitted to any of the educational institutions. Let them go anywhere they like. The country or the nation should not expect any thing out of them.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, it is easier to say that bad, weak and indifferent boys should better go anywhere else rather than be in any of the educational institutions merely to create nuisance in them, then it is to mould or reform them for any kind of national service. If you allow such students to go anywhere they like, I am sure, they will turn out to be nothing but *goondas* and criminals, and ultimately, our country will become a country of gangsters as South America or China has become. I strongly believe that in many of the less brilliant students there must be some good element, which, if we try to develop, will enable them to turn a new leaf in their career. Why should we not try to do that instead of helping them to ruin.

We should know that Nature has not distributed evenly in all the qualities of intelligence, courage, industry, determination, and hence, why should we hold the deficient students responsible for their deficiencies instead of accusing Nature or God who is the creator of all good and bad things in this universe? If we do not know how to make a bad thing better or a better thing the best, why should we claim any kind of credit for the marvellous achievements of mankind in so many fields?

Then again, if all were born as equally good, equally strong and equally talented, the whole world would have been flooded with prodigies or extraordinary men in the fields of science, art, philosophy, literature. But then, as we actually find, there are very few prodigies in any part of the world, the majority of the people are mediocres, and some of them are even fools, idiots or imbeciles! Hence, our duty should be how to make gold out of dust or diamond out of coal, and not merely to throw away dust and coal as useless stuff. We should, therefore, try improve our educational system by

improving our method of teaching, by prescribing the right type of text-books, by creating the real interest of the learners in the pursuit of knowledge, by giving them proper food for their intellectual development, by directing them through constructive channels, and on top of all, by trying to bring out all that is good in them

It is a pity that in our country education is the most neglected concern and as such, it has been going from bad to worse day by day, and we have come to such a pass that we cannot find any way out of the blind alley. We have been planning a lot and holding many conferences in order to improve our education but honestly speaking have we made even the least progress in this direction? In the first instance, very few of us have constructive ideas, and in the second instance, we do not care to implement what we plan, and in the third instance, we are all lazy and corrupt people, and that is why, all our educational planning has so far gone waste, and we have started crying, "How to increase the percentage of our literacy, how to improve our standard of education, how to provide the growing population with proper education, how to control all sorts of student-disturbances, student revolt and student unrest in our country". But cries will not help us as they have not helped us any way so far.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am not in favour of giving cheap or bad education to our population; I am not in favour of admitting third divisioners atleast to the Degree colleges and the universities for higher studies; I am not in favour of multiplying mushroom educational institutions; I am not in favour of appointing any and every body as a teacher in a school or a college; I am not in favour of sending children, boys or girls, to hovels or wretched buildings for their education. My idea of an educational institution is that it should be magnificent in structure, commodious in space, well-equipped with play-grounds, libraries, laboratories, reading-rooms, hostels etc so that the students may feel that they are out on a noble mission, a difficult and arduous enterprise, which every one of them will have to pursue and achieve with as much grit and talent as he possesses,

If you observe and analyse the law of natural selection which is operating everywhere on earth, what do you find ? You find that the unfittest things are weeded out while the fittest things are allowed to continue their existence. Why should we not follow the same law in the matter of our education too ? We should eliminate altogether all the rotten and deficient stuff *i.e.* all the worst students just as we do segregate the diseased from the healthy. The unfittest have no right to exist. Personally, I would recommend a complete extirpation of the race of the dullards, the fools and the idiots as I would recommend equally a complete extirpation of the incurably diseased, the crippled, the insane, as well as the vagabonds and the idlers under which category come the *fakirs*, the *sadhus* and the religious mendicants because all of them are useless stuff or parasites on the nation !

Seventh Speaker

Gentlemen, my immediately preceding speaker and one or two other speakers seem to be extremists, and propose for a drastic measure but I am not in favour of such radicalism. I would, on the other hand recommend that all good students should be segregated from all the bad or deficient students. There should be separate classes for each group ; and if the teachers concerned take proper care of them, I am sure, the bad students will become better while the good students will be the best. I do not deny that something is wrong with our educational system but I am not prepared to admit that everything is wrong with it. We should try to improve or correct whatever is wrong with the system instead of depriving our growing generation of the privilege of education altogether.

In my opinion, so far education is concerned, we should not believe in any kind of magnificent show although certainly we should have the minimum requirements or equipments in our educational institutions. The ancient Greek academies or even our own ancient *Vidyapits* had no outward show about them. Like the *Biswa Bharati* of Tagore at Shanti Niketan, the ancient educational institutions of Greece and India were very simple and unadorned ; but the teachers were learned scholars and the students also were devoted scholars ; and

that is why, those ancient educational institutions turned out many profound philosophers like Socrates, Plato, Sankaracharya, Yagyavalka, Gayetri and many others. Let us build up our schools, colleges and universities under that ancient pattern, as Gandhi also conceived of it, and let us produce as many profound scholars as possible. Last of all, I would like to say that the world should be wide enough for all the crippled, the diseased, the talented, the deficient, the demented, and even the insane, the blind, the dumb and the deaf. We should know once for all that man can not improve upon nature, that he can not make a horse out of a donkey, a man out of a horse ; and hence, why should we butcher the race of horses and donkeys (fools and idiots) and keep alive the race of human beings ? Let all live together and thrive as far as possible.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secur	70	out of 100 marks
Second Speaker	,	70	„ „ „ „
Third Speaker	,	50	„ „ „ „
Fourth Speaker	„	70	„ „ „ „
Fifth Speaker	„	60	„ „ „ „
Sixth Speaker	„	40	„ „ „ „
Seventh Speaker	„	50	„ „ „ „

REVIEW

Most of the speakers have done well and have given good arguments in defence of their position, either for or against. The sixth speaker alone has cut a sorry figure as compared with the other speakers ; otherwise independantly as a speaker he would have figured well. It seems, all the speakers are strongly in favour of the proposition or strongly opposed to it ; and therefore, the opposition has been very sharply brought out in this discussion. Some of the arguments, put forward, have some touch of novelty while others are old hackneyed.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has nothing to comment except to congratulate the speakers on their admirable performance. It is noteworthy that all the speakers are equally interested in the proposition for their discussion

Discussion No. 14

SHOULD CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BE ABOLISHED OR NOT ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, it is written in the Bible that God alone has the authority to judge the sinners and punish them ; man is not authorised to punish any sinner nor is he capable of judging a sinner. The Bible further says that man has no right to take away the life of anybody because he can not give life to anybody. Ofcourse, in ancient Greece there was one law known as *lex talionis* i.e eye for eye and tooth for tooth, or to put in plain words, giving tit for tat. This law was not the law of the jungle but of the most civilized Greeks and Romans ; and from this has followed the modern law of capital punishment i.e. if any body murders any body justly or unjustly, he should be punished with death either by hanging or by beheading or by electrocution which is the most modern method of capital punishment in America. Jesus Christ, however, tried to soften the law of retribution, which was only a law of revenge, by saying that if any body slaps you on the right cheek, you should lend him also your left cheek. Gandhi, Buddha and other Indian saints preached the same law of *ahimsa* or non-violence but unfortunately neither the Christians nor the Hindus have been following the law of love or *ahimsa* or non-violence. Gandhi tried to apply this law of *ahimsa* to politics but we know that Hindu-Muslim riots did not subside on that account, while on the other hand, India was partitioned on the communal basis or on the law of hatred and revenge, and that is why, till today Pakistan is quarrelling with India, and

sometimes even in India Hindus and Muslims fight with one another particularly when the Muslims in Pakistan are instigated to loot, plunder, rape, murder and set fire on the Hindus.

But just consider for a moment if any life, which has been killed, can be revived by killing the killer ; and if not, wherein lies the fun of capital punishment ? Capital punishment is definitely a brutal act whatever may be its justification. If man claims to be a civilized being why should he kill any of his fellowmen ? Even killing dogs or beasts in the jungle is a cruel act, although many people believe in hunting and shooting.

Then again, in the matter of capital punishment, how can you be sure that the judge is infallible, that he can not be influenced, that the evidence collected by the police for the conviction of a murderer is not faulty or even fabricated ? It is sometimes found that the innocent person is punished while the real culprit escapes. If we consider all these factors, we feel that capital punishment is not inhuman but also unjust.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, if man is the image of God, he must inherit some of the divine qualities such as intelligence, wisdom, insight etc , and hence, why should he not be able to judge a criminal or a sinner ? When man invented so many miracles of science, when he has made so many wise laws, why should he err only in the law of capital punishment ?

Then again, we should know that in modern days we live in a family, a particular society and under some kind of government, and hence, we should realise that our lives are interconnected and not independent of one another. We should know further that if one happens to do any injury to anybody, he must compensate that injury in some form or other ; otherwise the family or the society will be torn asunder, and we will have to live again like beasts in the jungle as absolutely apart or separate from one another. If a mad dog has to be killed, if a cancerous point in the human body has to be destroyed, if a diseased limb has to be amputated, so also a

criminal of the type of a murderer has to be removed from the world without any thought or consideration. If we go to abolish capital punishment, the crime of murder will go on increasing, and any body will take the life of any body else without a moment's thought or hesitation. You take away all the criminal laws, you will see how the various crimes of theft, burglary, cheating, forgery, swindling, robbery, dacoity, murder etc. go on multiplying because man is essentially a criminal as he is essentially also a brute !

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I am not at all in favour of capital punishment because it merely puts an end to the life of the criminal but gives him no chance of repentance or correction. I would, therefore, like suggest an alternative to capital punishment which the Britishers used to award in certain cases whenever the evidence for the crime was slightly doubtful, I mean, a life imprisonment in the Andaman islands which has now-a-days become a colony of the refugees from Pakistan. A life sentence would be an example or rather a warning to others and would deter them from committing any similar crime, and it would at the same time give a chance to the criminal concerned quite a long period (fourteen years) for repentance and correction of his criminal instinct.

Capital punishment breeds more crimes of the same nature because the children or brothers or other nearest relatives of the criminal who is awarded capital punishment invariably take revenge upon the man or any of the members of his family on whose account the criminal is condemned to death. Amongst the Wazirs, Masoods, Afridis and other tribes people of the North West Frontier Province (now Pakistan) used to take revenge like this *i.e.* commit murder for murder. Hence, capital punishment can be no remedy for the crime of murder.

We can not regard a murderer as a mad dog and kill him accordingly. A mad dog is incurable but a murderer being temporarily insane can be cured without any medicine but by merely conquering anger or the spirit of revenge. We should remember that we are no longer primitive people full of anger

and revenge as the beasts are, but on the other hand, we are civilized people, and as such, we are supposed to have conquered much of our baser instincts, and hence, our laws and punishments should also be humane in proportion to our education, light and culture. On this ground also, I would never support capital punishment although I know that even now-a-days there are many civilized brutes or beasts in the modern world, who would readily recommend capital punishment, not for themselves but for others and even for less heinous crimes than murder. We should know further that very few of the murders are cold-blooded murders, but on the contrary, they are committed in hot blood *i.e.* in fits of anger which is aroused by the revengeful spirit in man. Hence, if by some means or other the revengeful spirit can be cooled down, there is no possibility of the crime being committed at all. Hence, capital punishment would be wasted on such a criminal who readily cools down in his passion or readily repents for his crime.

Then again, capital punishment makes many young women widows and many children homeless orphans. Such widows and orphans would be the burden of the government of the country to which the criminal belongs. Now, just calculate the number of murders which are committed in our country per year and calculate also the corresponding liabilities of the Government in connection with the homeless widows and children of the condemned criminals. It would be indeed a huge burden.

Fourth Speaker.

Gentlemen, my question is, can you stop the crime of murder or any other crime which is far less heinous than the crime of murder? Why can you not stop the crimes particularly when you have got so many psychological methods (ways and means) of weakening or even conquering some of the baser instincts of human nature? Some people say that education and culture have a great deterrent effect upon crimes, particularly, upon the crime of murder; and because we have advanced quite a good distance in education and culture in the modern age, there is absolutely no need of capital punishment

for any kind of heinous crime, and that the penal code may be scrapped. But honestly between ourselves, sirs, have the crimes in the world decreased or subsided altogether, or has the crime of murder altogether disappeared atleast from the most civilized countries of the world ? I am sure, in reply to this question, you will say that crimes have not decreased, murder has not disappeared from any part of the world. Rather it is interesting to note that the more advanced a country is in science, education and culture, the worse it is from the point of view of crimes, because crimes are being committed mostly by the highly educated people. Science, Psychology and modern means of transport and communications are being used now-a-days by the educated class for the purpose of committing theft, burglary, forgery, murder etc. The crimes have become more scientific these days because the criminals are highly educated. Therefore, it is no good arguing that education or culture has any deterrent effect upon crimes. In spite of all kinds of reformatory efforts, crimes are multiplying day by day. It is said that in America, every fifth man is a criminal, and America is culturally the most advanced country in the world at present.

Gentlemen, you have got, first of all, to find out the cause of murder, and it is by removing those causes that you could possibly reduce or eliminate altogether the crime of murder and consequently also capital punishment from the human world. Murders are committed generally over money or land or women. In our country murders are committed mostly over money and land. In rural areas during cultivation days so many murders are committed in hot blood over the cultivation of fields ; and in the rural as well as in urban areas plenty of murders are committed for looting or robbing money mostly from travellers who move from place to place by cars or on the railroads with loads of bank notes or jewelleries. So far murders on account of women are concerned, they are indeed very few in our country probably because India has plenty of women or because there is plenty of scope for public as well as for private prostitution. America and Europe have tried several reformatory methods in order to reduce the number of crimes but in vain. Hence, for myself would

recommend capital punishment not only for the crime of murder but for all other crimes such as burglary, forgery, dacoity, robbery, raping or kidnapping etc

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, even if crimes be on the increase there is no justification for retaining the convention of capital punishment because it serves no purpose. You kill the murderer in a few seconds or moments by hanging him or by chopping his head or by putting him in the electric chair. I do not seem to follow how he feels the torture or the physical pain of the punishment unless you put him on the stake or burn him alive or get him bitten to death by mad dogs or cut his body to pieces bit by bit. These were the barbaric methods which the Moghal and the Pathan rulers of India used to follow while punishing even an ordinary criminal because they made no distinction between a thief and a murderer.

When punishment has no deterrent effect upon crimes, what is the fun of awarding punishments at all, and least of all, awarding capital punishment? Why should we not believe, on the other hand, that complete forgiveness extended to the criminal may have some moral effect upon him as it did have upon the thief of the Bishop's silver candle sticks? Why should we not believe also that when innocent Jesus Christ suffered the tortures of crucifixion in the hands of the Jews, his example of self-sacrifice had such a tremendous effect upon his murderers similar examples of self-sacrifice on the part of the victims of crimes will have the same salutary effect upon the criminals? That is why, Gandhi used to say, "If instead of punishing the criminals, we punish ourselves for nothing, our example of bodily suffering will have a tremendous psychological effect upon the criminals". I would like to add to the words of Gandhi, "When for ages we could not cure crimes by inflicting all sorts of punishment, would it not be wiser to adopt the indirect method of inflicting pain upon ourselves on behalf of the criminals who do us wrong or make us victims of their crimes? I think, such a method will have a far-reaching effect upon the criminal instinct of man and will slowly and gradually help to eradicate the instinct itself.

Sixth Speaker.

Gentlemen, the fifth speaker has talked of something absurd or impossible which will never come to happen. The English proverb—'forgiveness is the noblest revenge' is not at all true ; on the other hand, revenge is the only way to justice—whether you call it a jungle law or by any other name. When even revenge can not cure the criminal instinct in man, how can forgiveness cure it ? When every instinct of human nature is ingrained, how can it be changed or removed or cured by any means ? France abolished capital punishment but did the crime of murder improve there afterwards ? Certainly not ; and that is why, France has again introduced capital punishment in her Penal Code. In my opinion, politics, science and industries, greed for power and wealth have aggravated the criminal instinct in man. Why was such a good President as J. F. Kennedy shot dead ? Why was Abraham Lincoln assassinated when he was the liberator of America ? Why even Gandhi, who never raised even his little finger against a fly, was assassinated like Kennedy and Lincoln ? That is why, I say, man is essentially a criminally minded beast, and he can never be cured of his criminal instinct ; and hence, he should be shot down whenever he shows his criminal madness. That is the only remedy for crimes—if at all there can be any remedy for it. I am, therefore, in favour of the most brutal punishment for the murderer, for the forger, for the robber and even for the adulterer of food and drink !

Seventh Speaker

Gentlemen, it is wrong to say that man is essentially a criminally-minded creature or that the criminal instinct is incurable. Thousands of years ago, when man used to kill man and eat his flesh, he was not even conscious that he committed any crime or sin. But now-a-days, even while we commit the slightest offence, we feel guilty at heart, and why ? Because we have ceased to be a mere animal. The animality or brutality in man is definitely disappearing, day by day, although on the other hand crimes are increasing, and why ? Probably because of the adventurous spirit in man or because man wants

always something new, may be even a criminal spirit or criminal life. Life in the modern days, particularly in the most advanced countries, is being lived at a very high pressure, and consequently, every body is seeking relief from the pressure in all possible ways—sports, games, cinemas and even crimes. The little children of U S A. often find delight in the criminal acts of burglary and robbery just as a pastime because after having committed these criminal acts they return the stolen or looted property to the owner by some secret agents among their comrades so that the police may not find them out and get them penalised by law !

Gentlemen, in my opinion, it is better to scrap the penal code of every civilized country, and at the same time, treat all sorts of crime as nothing but various kinds of pastime, so that no body would take crime seriously, and nobody would like to commit any crime in future even for the fun of it. That is exactly why I strongly recommend the abolition of capital punishment.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures 65 out of 100 marks				
Second Speaker	„	40	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	65	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	50	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	40	„	„	„
Seventh Speaker	„	50	„	„	„

REVIEW

Most of the speakers have done equally well while one or two speakers have fallen below the mark. But the arguments advanced even by the best speakers are not very convincing probably because of the nature of proposition. The alternatives suggested by some of the speakers to capital punishment are not defensible at all ; and hence, there is no solution to the problem of capital punishment because there is no antidote to

the criminal instinct in man. Some of the arguments put forward by one or two speakers are interesting though none of them holds any water.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board is also at a loss to make any comment upon the discussions simply because the proposition by itself is such a knotty problem. The Board, however, appreciates most of the arguments put forward by the speakers, and feels that each of them has done well in his own way.

Discussion No. 15

WHO IS MORE SERVICEABLE TO SOCIETY—A TEACHER OR A DOCTOR OR A SOLDIER OR A PRIEST ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, in my opinion, a teacher is most serviceable to society. I will give you the following reasons on his behalf :—

1. A teacher is a guide, friend and philosopher to the ignorant, the superstitious, the blind.
2. A teacher makes his pupil familiar with the unfamiliar; he shows or explains the interconnections or inter-relations of things.
3. A teacher, like the priest, shows to his pupil the distinction between good and evil, between right and wrong, between truth and falsehood.
4. In ancient India a teacher used to be treated by his pupil more than his parents, his king, and as good as God to him ; and that is why, the pupil used to serve his teacher in every possible way—by collecting food and fuel, by doing all possible services as a servant would do to his master.
5. A teacher was in a way a dictator to his pupil, and it was the duty of the pupil to obey his teacher or *guru* or preceptor almost blindly *i e.* without any question.

6. A teacher is the caretaker not only of the mind and the soul of his pupil but he is also the guardian of the pupil's health, the pupil's moral and spiritual welfare.

7. The relationship between the teacher and the pupil is the most intimate relationship which is closer than the relationship even between the closest friends or between uterine brothers or between parents and children.

8. A teacher serves most not only his own pupil but also his country and even the whole human race because he is the real torch-bearer of knowledge, enlightenment, education, culture and civilization

9. Everybody needs a teacher for his guidance in life atleast for some years because it is impossible for any body to be self-inspired to know things of this universe without some torch light which, ofcourse, the teacher holds in his hand to lead the world from darkness to light.

10. Can you even learn to walk, to talk, to swim, to ride, or even to eat and drink without a teacher? Some kind of *Guru* is absolutely necessary for showing the first steps in every kind of knowledge or action

11. But how did the first man learn things? Was it from any teacher? Yes, Nature was his teacher. Ofcourse, Nature is a teacher to all provided one has eyes and ears for the lessons which Nature imparts upon every human being whoever lives in the midst of nature, and not in the artificial surroundings of towns and cities.

12. Without the help of a teacher man would for ever remain an ignorant, blind and superstitious human beast. Even in the matter of communion with God, the teacher has to work as the intermediary, a sort of go-between, who will communicate with God on behalf of his pupil or disciple. The Hindus, the Christians, the Muslims—all alike believe in this sort of intermediation on the part of the *Guru* or the priest or the *moulvi* to bring about some kind of spiritual contact between the seeker of Truth and God, the incarnation of Truth.

13. There is no hard and fast definition of a teacher.

Any body who happens to throw some light on a problem, who helps people out of a crisis, who enables them to tide over difficulties by showing the ways and means of escape from the crisis or the problem or the difficulty. So, in this sense, any body can be a teacher whoever possesses all kinds of knowledge, a great foresight and a great insight into things, an alertness or readiness of mind, and even courage and determination with which, to pursue or face or subdue an enemy.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, in my opinion, a doctor is far more serviceable than a teacher or a soldier or a priest. I give you the following reasons in order to justify my view-point :—

1. So long we are creatures of flesh and blood, we have our primary concern with the body and not with the mind or the spirit or the soul ; and when the body suffers from any kind of pain or disease, who relieves us of the pain or the disease ? Not, surely, the teacher or the soldier or the priest.

2. The doctor serves all—the teacher, the soldier, the priest and all other people to whichever trade or occupation or profession they may belong ; because no other man than the doctor knows the secrets of the human body or the secrets of herbs, chemical substances etc. which help to relieve pain or destroy the germs of diseases in the human body.

3. Just consider in the earlier centuries when people knew nothing about human physiology or anatomy or about the curative properties of the herbs and the chemical substances, they used to die like flies of ordinary diseases as well as of foul and chronic diseases such as pox, cholera, typhoid fever, malaria, plague, dysentery, tuberculosis and thousand other fatal diseases. But now with the progress of chemical and the medical sciences, every kind of the above diseases are curable as well as preventable.

4. Who attends or serves the sick, the wounded, the crippled in the hospitals, private clinics and nursing homes and also at home ? It is the doctor, and not the teacher or the

soldier or the priest. Every one of them has to take help from the doctor when he falls ill, when he is wounded by accident or even when he becomes a deranged brain or an unbalanced mind *i.e.* insane.

5 The doctor becomes a teacher, becomes a soldier to fight not only with the diseases but also to make fit the wounded soldiers in order to fight again with the enemy. The doctor becomes also sometimes a priest when he advises his patients to take certain kinds of food and drink for physical fitness, and also to undergo certain methods of physical or mental discipline for their mental fitness *i.e.* to be free from mental derangement or insanity of any kind.

6. A doctor is the greatest humanitarian, because he attends every sick or wounded or deranged person at the earliest call. He does not make any distinction between friend and foe, because his profession is so noble ; the doctor's profession is a profession of self-sacrifice, incessant vigilance with greater care and alertness than even soldiering would demand. The teacher's profession as compared with the doctor's profession is practically nothing because it involves no physical labour while the doctor's profession requires physical labour as well as mental exertion.

7. If there were no doctor in the battle field, I am afraid, the wounded soldiers could never fight and win any battle.

8. If there were no doctor in the areas of epidemics of cholera, plague, pox, dysentery, typhoid fever—I am sure, people would have died like flies.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, in my opinion, a soldier is the most serviceable man to his society or to his country. Even a doctor is also a soldier when he is in the battle-field. He makes the wounded soldiers fit for fighting again and winning the victory. He plays also the role of a teacher when he is the instructor ; without instructions how can soldiers fight ? Modern warfare is more a warfare of tactics and strategy, and therefore, a soldier has to play the role of a teacher to his fellow soldiers

in order to guide them, lead them and command them just as a teacher has to do with his pupils.

Who defends your country when it is attacked by another country? Who guards your motherland and saves your countrymen from death and destruction? It is the soldier, and nobody else. So, just consider for a moment how the soldier saves your life and property as well as your freedom and honour. If there were no soldiers at your back, you could any moment be turned from a free man into a slave, and what would be your life worth when you are in bondage? Freedom is the most precious thing on earth because it is intimately connected with honour, with peace of mind and happiness in life. If freedom is lost everything is lost. Even if you are a millionaire, how are you going to enjoy your wealth if you are not free to do so? Napoleon was the emperor of France but when he was captured in the battle of Waterloo and sent to the island of St. Helena as a prisoner, could he any longer claim himself to be the emperor of France, or could he enjoy his peace of mind or any kind of mental happiness, which is much more precious and enviable than bodily pleasure or enjoyment of any kind.

A soldier teaches you discipline, and sets before you an example of courage, self-sacrifice, power of endurance and hardship, love for one's motherland *i.e.* patriotism. Does a teacher or a priest teach you anything of the sort except in words? That is why I consider a soldier is much greater and nobler than a teacher or a priest or even a doctor.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, man is distinguished from birds and beasts by one quality *i.e.* the quality of the soul. It is the special privilege of man to possess the mind or the soul or even the heart which none of the lower creations is said to possess. Now, it is the priest who takes care of our soul, our mind, our heart, our spirit just as the doctor takes care of our body.

Now, the question is, which is more important for human existence—the body or the soul? In my opinion, the soul is

far more important than the body because the body is perishable while the soul is immortal, because the body is the servant while the soul is the master, because the body is subject to the five senses but the soul is perfectly free unless one allows his soul to be ruled by his body ; and that is the concern of the priest who helps us in making our soul free from all the shackles of the body because without the freedom of the soul there can not be any salvation in the sense that man can not be united with his Maker *i.e.* God.

In my opinion, the priest is the most serviceable man to all human beings because he ennobles, reforms, guides and guards their soul against any kind of degradation. The priest, one way, is the greatest teacher ; he, ofcourse, does not add to the knowledge of the phenomenal world but he certainly throws every possible light upon the inmost recess of the human heart or the soul. He is not the intellectual guide but he is the moral and spiritual guide to mankind, and as such his services are far more precious than those of the common teacher or the soldier or the doctor.

Just try to imagine gentlemen, what would have happened to mankind if there were no priest with them. Human beings would have fallen a victim to the baser instincts or impulses of the body, and their soul could never be freed from their body. Look at the criminals, the drunkards, the debauches and such other creatures who are slaves to their bodily desires, passions and weaknesses. They are nothing better than the brutes or beasts in the jungle who know nothing beyond eating and drinking and killing other animals in order to fill their maw (sto mach). So, the priest actually raises mankind from the level of brutes and beasts and brings them closer to the gods in the sense that they develop divine qualities of love, forgiveness, self-sacrifice, self-discipline, self-knowledge etc. which the lower creations do not possess. So, you can judge for yourselves, gentlemen, who is the greater or nobler being or who is more important and serviceable to mankind. Nobody can compare with the priest who is much nearer to God than any other human being.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker has talked too highly of the priest. He does not possibly know that the priest is a great hypocrite because he does not practise what he preaches, because he is as much a slave to his bodily passions as anybody else, because he exploits the ignorance of the common people and passes himself as the better man, the nobler soul than all other human beings which unfortunately he is not. He is no better than the common man; he is perhaps worse because he commits all sorts of crimes and sins and indulges also in all sorts of bodily enjoyments behind the screen which ofcourse the common superstitious and ignorant people are not supposed to know.

In my opinion, if there were no priestly order in the human world, mankind would have been much better off than they are now. The priest himself has never known or understood what truth is or what God is, and yet he talks glibly of them before the congregation and fools his listeners. The priest is probably the worst character, and he should be abhorred rather than revered or adored. It is really strange how millions of people inspite of their education and culture submit to the fooleries and knaveries of the priestly order not only in the Christian Community but also in the Hindu, Muslim or Sikh or any other community. The priest is the greatest enemy of mankind because he is the cause of all misguidance, all kinds of ignorance and superstition; and those, who identify the teacher with priest, actually insult and outrage the noble profession of teaching. I am, ofcourse, in favour of the teacher who teaches in schools, colleges and universities, and who introduces his pupils to the mysteries of the universe. A scientist is, in my opinion, the best teacher, because he really adds to human knowledge, while other teachers do not add much to human knowledge. A priest should never claim to be a teacher because he talks of things which he himself never knows. Does he know anything about God, about heaven or hell, about angels or devils, about the ultimate character or quality of the soul or of the mind or the heart? And yet he talks about these things to the congregation and makes a fool of others. That is why, I say, a priest is the

most hateful character in the world while a teacher is the most adorable character because he holds the real torch-light in his hand and guides mankind from darkness to light. That is why, he is the real deliverer of mankind.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, I have no regards for the doctor because he sells his knowledge or services at some price or other, because he is extremely selfish and mean, because he squeezes money from his patients, and instead of relieving their pain or curing their disease makes them all the worse, because he is just like a Jew or a money-lender or rather like a bug that sucks human blood only to fatten himself. If the doctor did selfless service, he would surely be the noblest person in the world. But, gentlemen, you know quite well how doctors exploit their patients, how they purposely aggravate their (patients') illness in order to squeeze out more money, how they often refuse to attend an urgent professional call, how they have an organised gang to whom they send round each of their patients for various kinds of tests or examination for the diagnosis of their (patients') disease in order to benefit each member of the gang !

Then again, the physicians of today, not only in our country but in every other part of the world, have become out and out mercenary, and that is why, the medical profession like most other professions or trades has become a commercial affair. Doctors, generally speaking, have no spirit of social service ; they have become more or less a race of sharks who care little for the poor patients who can not afford to pay the high fees of the doctors and who naturally have to suffer and die without any medical aid. Even in some of the Government hospitals, the doctors and the surgeons are alleged to neglect the patients in the general wards and rob the poor patients of their medicines and even their food and drink provided by the Government. There is a good deal of corruption in the medical profession, and hence, people have no regards for the physicians or the surgeons.

Seventh Speaker

Gentlemen, some of the preceding speakers have spoken too highly of the soldier which he does not deserve at all. The soldier is nothing but a mercenary creature who has no patriotism, no spirit of self-sacrifice, not even any courage for fighting with the enemy. It is only because the bayonet or the gun is pointed at his back that he has to march forward in encountering the enemy otherwise most of the soldiers would have run away from the battlefield to save their own life. Soldiers are no better than brutes because they kill their fellowmen in cold blood, which is much worse than the crime of murder. All soldiers are just like machines who act in the battlefield just as their commanders switch them to action. Most of the soldiers of the common rank and file have no better intelligence than that of the horses and donkeys. It is only the dregs of the population who actually join the armed forces while the cream of the nation join other trades and professions. When soldiers become victorious and besiege a country, one can not imagine what ravages they make on the peaceful civilian population, particularly on the young women whom they rape like brutes; they also kill the innocent little children and set fire to houses and destroy the property and the lives of the defenceless citizens whom they conquer. Would you call such creatures human beings or better than teachers, doctors, and priests? I would be the last man to regard them as such; and I really wonder how people admire them so much when they have no good quality about them except the quality of defending their own country against the enemy in the event of an aggression, and that too they do as mechanical mercenary tools.

Then again, it is because of the soldiers there is so much of conflicts in the world. There would have been no war if there were no soldiers. Hence, soldiers are the real menace to world peace.

Eighth Speaker

Gentlemen, some of the speakers have spoken too highly of the teacher, who, I am afraid, does not deserve so much of praise. It is only a teacher who knows what kind of a degenerate

race the teachers are. We can not be sure if the teacher in the ancient world was any way better than the modern teacher. We are told that the teacher in ancient India used to have all sorts of manual services from his pupil or disciple—from collecting food, drink, fuel, cloth and other necessities of life to taking every care of the *Guru's* body in the form of nursing at the sickbed or massaging the limbs for comfort and ease—as if the pupil were a bond slave ! Now-a-days, the village school master gets all sorts of necessary things from his pupils such as vegetables, milk, wheat or rice, cloth—whatever the pupils can secure for their Guru ! The teachers in the towns and the cities are more tactful in extorting much more enviable things from their pupils ; they get their occasional feeds at the restaurants, cinema shows, birthday gifts or gift on certain festival days, and, as a matter of fact, on any other excuse. The school, college and university teachers alike extort money from their pupils for helping them unfairly in their examinations by disclosing question papers, by awarding undeserved marks, by promoting some of the failed candidates to the next higher classes, by even allowing the pupils to copy from books the answers to questions in the examination hall ! How can you have any regards for such teachers who are worse than soldiers, doctors and priests ? Teachers often flatter themselves to be nation-builders ; but in my opinion, they are the corruptors of youth, the exploiters of their own pupils and their guardians, the greatest shirkers of duty, the worst idlers and pedantic fools !

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	75	out	of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	65	„	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	60	„	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	65	„	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	65	„	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„	„
Seventh Speaker	„	65	„	„	„	„
Eighth Speaker	„	50	„	„	„	„

REVIEW

Most of the speakers have done well. Every one has defended quite strongly either the teacher or the doctor or the soldier or the priest, and at the same time they have criticised equally strongly every one of the four professions. It is, therefore, difficult to judge them individually. The only thing that can be said is that everything has its own place in this universe, and, therefore, nothing can be declared as completely useless.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board notes with pleasure that all the candidates have taken part in the discussion with keen interest, which clearly proves that the proposition is of universal interest. The arguments put forward by the speakers have some touch of personality about them, which alone is the remarkable feature in the present discussion.

Discussion No. 16

SHOULD MILITARY TRAINING BE COMPULSORY ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, the international sky of today is always being overcast with the clouds of war. Look at China, Africa, the Arab countries, Latin America, Pakistan, Viet-Nam, and even at U.S.A. who is at present hotly engaged in Viet-Nam. Consider also the race in nuclear weapons between Russia and U.S.A., and consider also the deep-rooted split between China and Russia. You should consider also the great antagonism created between Communist and Capitalism—all of which are unmistakable signs of the outburst of a world war at any moment. Last of all, consider also the invasion of India by China in 1962, and the aggression upon Kashmir by Pakistan, once in 1948 and again in 1965. Can we or any other nation, under these circumstances, remain idle without arming ourselves, without strengthening our defences or without introducing compulsory military training into our schools, colleges and universities and even into all other establishments, organisations, societies, and institutions wherever it is possible to do so ?

If we train the youths of our country ahead of the approaching catastrophe, they can form the second, the third or the fourth line of defence as the occasion would demand in moments of emergency. We are already training soldiers in all the branches of the armed forces in our military academies, but these may not be sufficient for the purpose, and hence, if we train also the students and other youths in the military

science and art, we can be comparatively secure against surprise attacks from any country in the world.

If we make military training compulsory upto certain age, and introduce it into all educational institutions, factories and workshops, we are sure that we will be able to solve another great problem which has been recently troubling us from year to year—the problem of unrest or indiscipline among students and other youths of our country. Military training will make the youths perfectly disciplined in mind and body, and thereby will save them from vandalism or hooliganism and from the waste of their precious time and energy which they would be able to devote to nobler causes or missions of their individual and national life. The student community has of late grown extremely rowdy and undisciplined for various reasons, and military training is the only cure for such maladies. It is a fact that both students and teachers are these days becoming a race of idlers and vagabonds, and that is why, their brains have become the devil's workshop. I, therefore, strongly vote for compulsory military training.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, why should we anticipate war, and why should we arm ourselves all the more vigorously in anticipation of it? For the last two decades many countries have been arming themselves and also piling up nuclear weapons in their arsenals in anticipation of a nuclear war. But has such a war come till today? The attack of China on India or the raid of Pakistan upon Kashmir was no war, while the skirmishes which are going on between U.S.A. and Viet-Cong is no war at all. When the whole world is trying to disarm itself atleast for the last five years or so, and when the major nations are anxious for world peace, why should we waste unnecessarily our precious money on compulsory military training with a view to strengthen our defences for an emergency?

If we impose compulsory military training upon students on the honest plea of bringing them under discipline, their education will definitely suffer because military training and scholarship can not go together. Either be soldiers or be

students ; but you cannot be both at the same time. Military training robs man of his intellect, his emotions or sentiments, and even his spiritualism ; but the aim of education is not merely to build up the muscles or to train the mind for killing or to turn a human being into a machine or a brute. It is not for the sake of economy that I do not want to introduce military training into educational institutions ; but it is for the sake of saving the youths of our country from intellectual, moral and spiritual degeneration that I am pleading against compulsory military training. Students can be brought under discipline by so many methods, means and ways *e.g.* by making them take part in games and sports, by making manual labour compulsory or atmost by enlisting them in the N.C.C. which is a semi-military organisation and which will serve the purpose of both *i.e.* education and military training. We have already introduced N.C.C. in every one of our universities, and there is no need of compulsory military training at all for the time being. If the students of today are going wrong, if they are not busy with their books, if they go to the pictures too frequently, if they have become eve-teasers, it is no fault of theirs but it is definitely the fault of the teachers in the educational institutions and also the fault of the guardians at home because now-a-days the teachers are first class shirkers of their duties while the guardians are too busy with their bread problem.

Then again, all youths may not be interested in military training at all, and so, what kind of soldiers or officers they will make if they are forced to undergo military training. It is wrong to believe that military training alone can make the youths tough, courageous and fit for the struggle for existence. If it were so, all the civilians would have joined the armed forces. But how many actually join the armed forces ? Only those who can not make a mark in their studies or those who are interested only in physical courage, physical strength and physical skill. Brilliant students never join any of the armed forces because they can find there any scope for their intellectual, moral or spiritual development.

Then again, you can be a good player of any of the

games ; you can be a good boxer, swimmer, wrestler without joining any of the armed forces. You can develop your patriotic spirit, your courage, your discipline even without being a soldier. Do you mean to say that the administrators of our country are not disciplined persons or that the legislators are not patriotic people? Soldiering does not necessarily make a patriot or a disciplinarian. It is wrong to believe that military training inspires self-confidence, emotional stability or poise. If you subject yourself to any kind of discipline of the body or the mind without being a soldier, you can surely acquire sufficient power of self-control or self-restraint. It is equally wrong to believe that by military discipline alone you can bring about national integration or you can rise above all kinds of communalism, casteism, provincialism and linguism.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I thoroughly agree with the second speaker, and I want to support his view-point with the following additional arguments :—

1. Toughness of the body is not attained merely by parades and drills ; even sports and games, wrestling and other kinds of physical exercise can make your body equally tough, strong, hardy ; they can make you courageous and alert also.

2. Do not think that patriotism or nationalism is a thing of the body but it is essentially a quality of the head and the heart, and not of the body at all, and hence, patriotism or nationalism can be acquired by cultivating intellectualism and emotionalism.

3. Casteism, groupism, sectarianism, communalism—all are prejudices of the mind, and hence, they have nothing to do with military training which is entirely a bodily training.

4. Freedom can not be achieved or maintained by means of arms only We may lose our freedom if we become morally degraded, if we remain intellectually backward or economically poor. India fell a ready victim to the Moghal and Pathan invaders and she remained a slave to Britain for about two centuries not because she had no trained soldiers but because she

was an exceptionally poor, backward and even degraded country when the foreign invaders took possession of her.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, it may be true that without moral, intellectual and economic development a country can not attain her independence or maintain her freedom ; but then armed forces also have to play an important role in it. I admit that it is the intellectuals that hatch revolutions but it is the armed forces that lead the revolutions to the victory stand. My two preceding speakers have laid an undue stress upon intellectual culture and moral or spiritual ideal but they forgot altogether that when a country is invaded by any other country, where goes intellectual culture or the moral or spiritual ideal ? It is the armed forces that save the situation. Hence, whether students or businessmen or common labourers or servants in the various government or private offices or the workmen in the various industrial and commercial concerns must join hands in order to offer the stiffest resistance to the invader ; but how can they do it if they are not previously trained as soldiers ?

Freedom should be placed on the top of all privileges ; and if freedom is lost everything is lost. Hence, it is no good saying that we are not interested in soldiering or military training ; and it is still saying that our Constitution has given us the right to do anything or not, to choose our line of action any way we like provided it does not go against law and order, against national integrity ; but we should not forget that it is our unwritten bounden duty, whether laid down in our constitution or not, to protect our motherland against any invader in the world ; but how can we do it successfully except by undergoing a regular military training before our motherland is attacked by an invader.

Fifth Speaker.

Gentlemen, military training is absolutely necessary for all able-bodied youths. It would make them smart, keep them physically fit, develop in them the team spirit as well as alertness, regularity, punctuality, courage and so many other

qualities ; and, on top of all, it will develop the quality of leadership which can not be developed by any other training.

It is a wrong notion that military training requires only physical capacity. Modern warfare has become absolutely a tactical and strategic contest in which the brain, and not muscle has to play the most important role. Military training will help us not only in defending our country against aggression but it will make a healthy and strong, smart and active nation. Just look at the health and laziness of the youths of our country. Most of them are diseased and weak while others are lazy and inactive. The youths of today do not seem to be interested in anything except eating and sleeping or gossiping and wasting their energy in frivolous activities. If they are subjected to military training they will be cured of all these weaknesses, deficiencies or short-comings, and they will begin to find considerable interest in every kind of useful work.

Indian climate is already enervating, and India is a victim of many of the tropical diseases which can be cured only by regular exercise, active habits and diligent work—all which are possible only by military training.

Indians for ages have been philosophers, speculators and dreamers, and this idealistic temperament has proved fatal to the entire population. We never believed in hard work ; we never practised bodily discipline ; we were never a military race ; and that is the only reason why India has been the victim of foreign aggressions for centuries. But now, after Independence, we should shake off our lethargy and prepare ourselves for the hardest work which military training alone can offer.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, it is a wrong notion that the soldier alone can help a country in its all-round development. Every country, in order to attain or maintain all kinds of progress, prosperity, development, security, stability, has to utilize the services of all sections of the population—the teacher, the soldier, the industrialist, the trader, the scientist, the priest, the politician, the doctor, the economist etc. In the fabric of modern society

or state, nobody alone can contribute any completeness to it; hence, military training is as much necessary as the study of the humanities, as sports and games, as science, industries, trade and commerce. The question is whether it should be made compulsory or not. If it is not made compulsory very few will join it, and the total scheme will fail miserably as the N.C.C. programme failed in the beginning and for some years later till it was made compulsory for all students in our country. Indians by habit and tradition are so lazy and inactive that they require some kind of compulsion in order to activate them. Compulsory military training is the best way to activate the most lethargic race in the world. Lethargy is the chief cause of the downfall of India in every sphere.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50	out of 100 marks				
Second Speaker	„	65	„	„	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	40	„	„	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	40	„	„	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	40	„	„	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	30	„	„	„	„	„

REVIEW

Except one or two speakers none has done well, probably because very few of the candidates are interested in the proposition for discussion, or because most of them are ignorant of military training. The arguments, put forward by most of the speakers, are stale, commonplace and even dull and hackneyed, and as such, they can not inspire any strong contest between the two opposing parties. It is rather unfortunate for the youths of today not to be interested in such an interesting topic for discussion.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board regrets that the proposition did not inspire any interest in the speakers although some of the speakers argued their respective position rather in a callous and indifferent manner. The Board expects that in future the youths of India should be more well-informed about the various topics for discussion which may come up before the Services Selection Board.

Discussion No. 17

IS BEAUTY MOST ADORNED WHEN UNADORNED?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, let us, first of all, try to understand what the proposition really means. As far as I have been able to understand, it means, "Does a pretty woman look the prettiest if she is not adorned with artificial decorations such as all sorts of cosmetics, fine clothes and ornaments?" This is definitely a controversial proposition because some people will say that without artificial decorations not even a pretty woman can look prettier while other people will say that a really beautiful woman would look pretty even if she goes with any kind of adornments. But I am of opinion that a woman who is naturally beautiful needs no cosmetics or fine clothes or ornaments in order to look more beautiful. On the other hand, artificial decorations spoil or reduce natural beauty. Do you, gentlemen, find any artificial decoration in any object of nature, and yet are not the natural objects quite attractive to the eye? Nature is always naked, and it is in her nakedness that we find her beauty. Does a rose require any further decoration to enchant the eye? Does a rainbow or butterfly require any touch of extra colour from the brush of a painter in order to look more beautiful than it is? Surely not. Do the snows on the mountain tops, the green blades of grass, the creeping plants, the sunset or the sunrise, the silver moon or the twinkling stars, the floating clouds, the flowing streams, the variegated birds and animals require any further decoration from the hands of man to look more enchanting?

A beautiful woman who is naturally beautiful would always look attractive whether she uses any lipstick on rouge or cream or powder, whether she puts on any fine garments or not, and whether she uses any ornaments on any of her limbs. Some people may think that a beautiful woman would look more beautiful with all such decorations but that is a wrong idea. Even in her complete nudity she would look quite beautiful because her beauty depends upon her natural complexion, upon the symmetry of her limbs, upon the form and shape of her entire body as also upon her graceful gait and carriage.

In my opinion, it is only the men and women who are deficient in complexion, in form and shape of the body that do require some kind of make-up to hide their natural deficiency. A beautiful person never attaches any value to his dress because he knows that the very shape and form of his body would attract the eye of people. He is not even conscious that he is handsome and that is why, he is so indifferent to any kind of artificial adornment.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I want to put one question to my preceding speaker, namely, why then man or woman decorates himself or herself with so many articles of beautification? My friend will probably say that we use so many things simply because we find others using them or because such articles are found in the market and we are told also for what purpose they should be used. May I put another question to my honourable friend, namely, why does he not eat only rice and bread and not fish, meat, eggs, vegetables and thousand other articles of food? He will probably say in reply that it is because man has invented or discovered these things and found them delicious to the taste. May I put him my last question, namely, does any of these things add to his taste? If he says, yes, I would atonce say that in the case of personal decorations too they add to natural beauty and make it more attractive and alluring to the eye. Here is the vital point on which I take my stand in order to emphasise the truth that beauty when adorned adorns the most. I offer you the following arguments in support of my view-point :—

1. If a man or a woman is perfectly nude and if they are naturally beautiful, they may look more beautiful in the eyes of the passional people only but they would positively look ugly in the eyes of the dispassionate onlookers. But if they are robed in fine garments in a graceful manner they would look ten times beautiful than they naturally are.

2. I want to know, gentlemen, why God has created leaves for the flowers, for the twigs and branches? Surely for extra beautification. Why is the rainbow of seven colours? Why is the butterfly spotted on its wings? Why is the leopard spotted on its skin? Why is the zebra striped all over? Why does the peacock has such variegated plumes? Why are the clouds not of one colour only? Why are they black, dark, grey, silvery or fleecy? Why does the setting-sun give out dolphin hues? Because Nature also needs some kind of variation in colour or particle in texture in order to look more beautiful than she actually is. Therefore, why should not man or woman need some extra articles of decoration in order to look more enchanting than they actually are?

3. What's about men and women who are comparatively less beautiful if not positively ugly? If such a woman does not take the help of any of the artificial decorations, she would never be looked at or cared for by any man; and she would probably never have the chance of getting married.

4. If you do not shave your chin daily or if you do not crop your hair atleast once a fortnight, would you look really attractive? Definitely not. If you do not put on any decent dress, whether dhoti or trousers, kurta or shirt, would you look decent in the eyes of any? Surely not.

5. If artificial decorations had no value, there would not have been so many beauty products in the market; there would not have been so many varieties of trousers, frocks and *sarees*; there would not have been so many tailoring shops to make such a variety of garments.

6. Gentlemen, you must be knowing that decoration has become a specialised art, and it has got to be studied as much

as any other art such as music, painting, dancing etc. Every decent house in Europe or America has to be decorated elegantly in order to give a new look to it. Whenever there is any public ceremony, any social function, any wedding or any such ceremonial occasion, a decorator is invited to add beauty to the pandal so that the congregation may feel that some great function is being celebrated. If there were no electric lights, no festoons, no curtains, no tapestries hanging, fluttering, shining on such occasions, the people would not feel that anything special or ceremonial is occurring.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I am sorry, I can not agree with my preceding speaker that a thing, which is beautiful in itself requires any extra decoration for lending fresh charms to it. A child, who is as beautiful as Cupid or a woman who is as attractive as Venus or Diana, does not require any extra decoration to make them more attractive. Natural beauty is genuine beauty, while artificial beauty is a false glitter, and as such it is perishable. Just take away the coating of the cosmetics of rouge, powder, cream, lipstick etc. from the face of a woman who is not naturally beautiful; just remove all the ornaments from her body, and see for yourselves, gentlemen, how she looks. She would look definitely ugly. But take away all such decorations from the body of a naturally beautiful woman : it will make no difference at all, but on the other hand, she may look all the more beautiful. So, it is only the naturally ugly things which require artificial decorations in order to make up their deficiencies, while the naturally beautiful things require no artificial make-up in order to make them more attractive in the eyes of the world.

Just as God or Nature has created many beautiful things in this universe, man too wants to invent many articles of decoration in order to make God's creations more beautiful i.e. to improve upon God's or Nature's art. But man is a pigmy before Nature or God because man himself is their (God's or Nature's) creation, and therefore, how can he dare improve upon their art ? And yet from the dawn of the human race, man has been impelled by his sense of beauty, his sense

of music, his sense of symmetry and concord, to add touches to the butterfly, the lily and the rainbow. But has he been able to make them more beautiful even by a whit on his canvas with his brush and colours? Certainly not. He has painted only a glow-worm instead of the moon, a gnat instead of the butterfly, an odd replica of colours instead of the rainbow.

Woman's instinct is also the same as that of a man. She decorates her house, her children and herself too in order to make them beautiful. Ofcourse, the uglier the woman, the more she will try to decorate herself (not ofcourse her house or children) in order to make up her deficiency. But a beautiful woman would prefer to decorate all her surroundings but not herself, not because she is conscious of her beauty but because her inward nature feels perfectly satisfied with what she is or has. You must have noticed, gentlemen, that uglier a woman is, the more constantly she will consult the mirror in order to make sure that she is not ugly at all, while a really beautiful woman rarely looks at her image in the mirror simply because she has no further hankering to beautify herself—she is perfectly contented with what she is or what she has.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, personally speaking, I do not find any beauty at all in nakedness, in naturalness, in disorderliness, in any kind of odd mixture of thing; but on the other hand, I find beauty in symmetry, in concord, in harmony, and in all sorts of perfect blending of sounds and colours which alone give rise to master-pieces of songs and paintings.

I want to put you, gentlemen, a straight question—was this world more beautiful than now when man just came on earth, or has this world been beautified or made ugly by man? Some of you will say that man has disfigured Nature's canvas by punctuating the earth's surface with so many towns and cities, so many small or huge buildings, so many constructions of canals, dams, railroads and other demarcations of lands. I would not agree with such people at all. But there are others amongst you who would say that man has beautified earth's surface by building towns and cities and demarcating them

from the rural areas, by raising all sorts of constructions of architecture, by building monuments such as the Taj Mahal, the leaning tower of Pisa, the bronze statue of Colossus in the Mediterranean Sea, the Pyramids of Egypt, the hanging Tower of Babylon, and so many other marvels of architecture. I would certainly agree with these latter gentlemen who believe that man too adds to the beauty of the earth as much as Nature or God does. If you sincerely believe that man is a portion of Nature or an image of God, you must believe also that man has as much taste of beauty as God, or Nature has, and therefore, his impulse for beautifying himself or his partner (woman) or his surrounding world is not an unnatural hankering.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, whatever my preceding speaker may have to say, I believe in natural beauty and not in artificial beauty—I believe in nakedness, as Nature herself is, and not in clothing Nature with all the foolish trappings which man has created so far only to make the beautiful ugly! Man has only disfigured the beautiful face of the earth by cutting down the forests and jungles, by demolishing some of the hillocks, by building embankments on the rivers, by raising the tall sky-scrapers as the sons of Cain in the Bible wanted to build up a tower (the Tower of Babel) in order to reach Heaven!

You must be knowing, gentlemen, that man being tired of artificial decorations started the culture of Nudism, which is a culture of both health and beauty, from which you easily conclude that man has degenerated much in health and beauty ever since he took to all sorts of trappings for the body. It is a fact that by being robed in cotton or woollen clothings for ages, man has become extremely delicate *i.e.* sensitive to heat and cold, and naturally, he can not stand sun or shower so much now-a-days as he could do centuries ago. The result is that man has started suffering from all kinds of diseases which are partly due also to various kinds of artificial food he now-a-days takes giving up his natural food. The very fact that man has walked away from Nature and has built towns and cities for his habitation clearly proves the potent cause of his

degeneration in health and body. Just try to visualise the wonderful physique of the ancient Greek and Roman human figures—how beautiful, symmetrical, healthy and strong they were, and how degenerate, dwarfish, weak, and even ugly their modern descendants are ! In India too, the Aryans were like the ancient Greeks and Romans because they lived more in a state of nature ; but now-a-days, look at their descendants—the Bengalis, Biharis, Oryas, Madrasis, and others who have been living in towns and cities and heavily robed in cotton and woollen clothes. It is artificiality which has brought about this great degeneration in health and beauty, and yet if you say, gentlemen that beauty when adorned is most beautiful, I have nothing to say but strongly differ with you. I would, on the other hand, say that beauty unadorned is most beautiful !

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	70	out of 100	marks
Second Speaker	„	75	„ „ „ „	
Third Speaker	„	75	„ „ „ „	
Fourth Speaker	„	50	„ „ „ „	
Fifth Speaker	„	50	„ „ „ „	

REVIEW

The first three speakers have done admirably well. They have given many arguments which can not be easily refuted. The last two speakers have done not very badly but not so well as the first three speakers. It is creditable on the part of all speakers to have defended their view-points by throwing new lights on the proposition ; but it is rather disappointing that out of twelve candidates, only five candidates have taken part in the discussion

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board notices with pleasure that the subject for discussion is rather uncommon, atleast for those candidates

who generally appear before the Services Selection Board. In the opinion of the Board, the proposition set for discussion is rather difficult in the sense that for the prospective officers of the Armed Forces, there is hardly any distinction between beauty and ugliness, between artificiality and naturalness. What matters to soldiers is not the same thing as matters to civilians ; and hence, it is rather remarkable how so many candidates could get interested in the discussion of such a topic, which is fairly difficult even to understand.

Discussion No. 18

HOW FAR IS THE POLICY OF NON-ALIGNMENT PRACTICABLE IN THE MODERN WORLD ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, let us, first of all, try to understand what non-alignment really means, and it is only then, we can judge correctly how far it is practicable or impracticable. You must be knowing, gentlemen, that non-alignment is a foreign policy invented or formulated by Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru in the field of international politics with a view to prevent military alliances with the Power blocs, which, according to Nehru, are secret designs for military aggression upon weaker countries and also for their exploitation. Nehru, when he noticed the tendency of the modern nations to align themselves in order to form power blocs, foresaw the danger of this tendency, and he foresaw in this tendency particularly the danger of producing conflicts between the nations or the countries instead of creating harmony and peace. Nehru thought that if the various nations remained non-aligned atleast in their military relations or alliances, they would be able to carry on peacefully their development programmes and thereby enhance and quicken their material progress. America, for atleast fifty years cut herself off from European politics *i.e.* she followed a policy of non-alignment, and that is why, she was able to advance herself so much and so quickly in all fields of development and progress, particularly, in the fields of science, industries and technology. America is now-a-days the richest and also the most powerful country in the world. But then, unfortunately,

America was drawn into the last two World Wars, not by herself but by Great Britain, who, for the first time, injected into the American national mind the virus of active interest in European or rather world politics, and along with it, also the virus of ambition for a worldwide exploitation and supremacy which Great Britain had been actively pursuing for the past three or four centuries. Nehru very shrewdly noticed this great change in America, and he noticed further that Great Britain had initiated America to the idea of forming a World Organisation like the United Nations in place of the League of Nations, which failed for various reasons, in order to build up a mighty power bloc and to use it slowly and gradually for the purpose of extending British and American supremacy over the West and the East. That is exactly what the United Nations stands for, although superficially speaking, it has got its General Assembly and the Security Council with the ostensible programme of settling the various international disputes and problems, and also its another great branch known as the UNESCO, the ostensible aim of which is to develop and propagate ethical, scientific and cultural programmes among the member nations of this great world organisation known as the United Nations.

Gentlemen, Nehru noticed further how Great Britain after the liquidation of her empire in the East and the West, very cleverly manipulated some of the countries like Canada, Australia, India, Burma, Pakistan, Ceylon and others in order to form another organisation (*i.e.* power bloc) known as the Commonwealth of Nations in order to regain and re-establish the lost power and supremacy of Great Britain. Nehru noticed also that both America and Britain formed a few territorial defence organisations such as CENTO, NATO, SEATO, on the plea of preventing the possibilities of a world war again; but the real intention behind all these military or defence organisations is nothing but to curb the spread of Communism in the East as well as in the West. Communism has become such a bug-bear in the eyes of all Western nations, and particularly, in the eyes of Great Britain and America that most of the Western nations are determined to fight to a finish, by a nuclear or conventional war, the menace of Communism in any part of the world, whether in Cuba or in Latin America or

In Algeria or in Cambodia or in Indonesia or in China. Nehru noticed all these complications, and that is why, in order to save the world, not merely the East but also the West, he formulated the most wonderful strategy of non-alignment. At the Bandung conference, where many of the Afro-Asian countries assembled, Nehru explained the real implications of non-alignment in international politics, and he at once drew the most serious attention or consideration of the new political formula, not only by the smaller Afro-Asian countries but also by such great and powerful countries like Russia and China. China, unfortunately, for reasons best known to herself, dropped out altogether from her pledge. Khrushchev used to appreciate very highly Nehru's two great formulae of Non-alignment and Co-existence. India has been consistently following the policy of non-alignment for the last eighteen years or more ever since she became politically independent, and by this policy she has been able to draw closer to herself two great antagonistic powers *i.e.* Russia and America who have been helping India in many directions *viz.* technical aid, food supply during famine, financial aid for development programmes and even arms and ammunition in moments of crisis as India had to face two unprovoked conflicts from Pakistan and one from China. That is why, I say that non-alignment is a very practicable and also helpful foreign policy.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker, like Nehru, did not think of the wrong side of non-alignment. Nehru had so much faith in non-alignment that he could never imagine how sometimes non-alignment is not workable or practicable. There are certain occasions when alignment is urgent and inevitable, for example, when a weak country is attacked by a powerful country how can she save herself without taking military aid from some other more powerful country? Did not India seek the help of America, Britain and Russia when China made a surprise attack on her? If America, Britain and Russia had not rushed arms and ammunition in October, 1962, we are sure, China would not have cried such an abrupt halt to her advancing aggression in NEFA or in Ladakh, China would

have positively taken an advantage of our unpreparedness and would have probably infiltrated further into our territory if some of the most powerful countries had not rushed their war material at the psychological moment. Does any body mean to say that during that crisis, India was non-aligned with Russia or America or Britain? Then again, when India, during any year of an acute shortage of food, demands any supply of wheat or rice from Canada or Australia or America, does it mean that India is not aligned with those countries? That is why, some of the critics of the policy of non-alignment say that non-alignment is a strategy of opportunism or the tactics of running with the hare and hunting with the hound. To be more practical and concrete in our estimate of non-alignment, we should consider the position or attitude of any neighbouring country in the event of another world war, say, between China and U.S.A. Let us better take the case of India when caught in such a war; what should be the policy of India towards U.S.A., China and Russia? Can India remain completely non-aligned or neutral without lining up either with U.S.A. or with any of the two communist countries, which are our nearest neighbours. If we align ourselves with U.S.A., both China and Russia will play havoc with us or U.S.A. and her chief ally, Britain, will try to devastate India as much as they can do. So, in any case of such a world crisis can India keep aloof from the Devil or the deep sea? In my opinion, not only India but most of the under-developed countries shall have to line up with either U.S.A. and Britain or with Russia and China. Hence, non-alignment becomes absolutely meaningless or useless in the event of a world war. We have seen during the last two World Wars how the bigger and the smaller countries grouped themselves with one party or the other for self-preservation, which is the strongest instinct of human nature and which always gets the precedence over all other instincts or impulses or decisions.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker has tried to prove the impracticability of the policy of non-alignment particularly in moments of acute need or crisis; but then, his conclusions

are rightly drawn from the premises. I will merely state or rather point out the benefits of non-alignment and also elaborate them so that you may be thoroughly convinced of the practicability of non-alignment which will cut ice in normal as well as in abnormal times.

But following the policy of non-alignment we can get the following benefits :—

1. Friendliness to all nations and enmity from no nation.
2. Economic and other forms of aid from all countries without any political string.
3. No fear of military aggression except from a country which is basically mean, jealous and treacherous.
4. Peaceful development of normal projects.

The chiefest benefit of non-alignment is that it does not inspire in any nation or country any kind of misunderstanding which is the root of all quarrels between nations and countries. Non-alignment does not mean complete aloofness from the world nations or countries, but it means, on the other hand, absolute non interference with the affairs of any nation or country ; it means a further kind of non-rivalry, non-competition which leads to no jealousy or misunderstanding or strife of any sort. A non aligned country does not thrust any of her views or opinions on any other country on any of the international affairs ; she does not take part in any of the domestic quarrels of any other country, and as such, she is treated as a perfectly neutral country for all practical purposes ; and that is why, she is actually friendly to all countries and inimical to none, on the basis of which she can expect atleast an attitude of apathy or indifference but not an attitude of enmity from any corner of the world. To be friendly to all countries, and not to be inimical to any country is a great advantage in the present-day world where there is so much of unfriendliness and enmity leading to frequent armed hostilities that disturb the peace and harmony of the entire human world.

Then again, gentlemen, if a country remains neutral or non-aligned, it has got the prospect of receiving all sorts of help in moments of need, particularly, for the development of various peaceful projects—scientific, industrial, agricultural,

technological, educational or cultural. There are certain countries like America and Russia which are highly developed countries, and which, as such, can render a lot of financial aid as well as lend some kind of scientific, technological and industrial aid to any country which is a neutral country or at least which is not aligned with any of the countries which is inimical to either America or Russia. India being a non-aligned country has been able, during the last twenty years, ever since the attainment of her political independence, to secure a lot of financial and technical aid ; and even during any year of the shortage of food due to drought or any other cause. India has been receiving a good supply of wheat and rice particularly from Canada, Australia and America. Pandit Nehru was really one of the most far-sighted and the wisest statesmen of the world ; otherwise he could not have tided over so many of our national calamities, chiefly, the shortage of food and the need of arms and ammunition, particularly, at the time when China attacked India in 1962, mainly because India is a non-aligned country. Even Russia supplied us some of the war materials which we had to use against China when she had sprung a surprise attack on us. No Communist country would like to help any one against any another communist country, and yet Russia helped us a lot against China without attaching any political string to her aid, simply because Russia knows that India is a non-aligned or neutral country.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am afraid, my preceding speaker has not been able to prove his case in favour of non-alignment. As a matter of fact, no country in the world can be so self-sufficient in every respect that she would require no help from any other country at any crisis. Why did America join hands with Britain, or Russia sided with America and Britain during the World War of 1939 ? Why did Italy side with Germany ? And why did Japan, a country of the Far East, line up with Germany and Italy ? Why did France join hands with Britain against Germany ? It was not a question of mere chance or whimsical preference ; but it was a necessity out of either mutual proximity or mutual sympathy of the

various member-nations of the opposing power-blocs which forced them to align themselves for or against one another. Many of the critics might raise the pertinent question—what business either Japan or America had in the strife when the Second World War, like the first one, was localised in Europe? It was Britain that dragged America into the war every time; and so far Japan is concerned during the Second World War, she became unduly powerful and ambitious due to her phenomenal developments in science, industries and technology. Besides, Japan like Germany because also unduly ambitious of power. Japan thought that she would become the sole master of the Far East because China or Russia was not what they are now. America too indulged in the ambitious dream of being the master of the Pacific which she and Britain actually became atleast for some years after the termination of the hostilities so long Japan was under military occupation, and Russia were just in the cradle of their military strength or power. During the last two decades, Russia developed her nuclear power while China became highly militarised; and hence, neither China nor Russia could curb the ambitions of Japan during nineteen thirties or forties. And so far America is concerned, Britain being the mother country for America, she would have and she actually did divide the spoils of the two World Wars between herself and America, and therefore reigned supreme over the Atlantic and the Pacific till nineteen forties. So, gentlemen, from the concrete illustrations I have given you, you can easily find out that the policy of non-alignment is not at all practicable.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I will also give you certain concrete examples which will prove conclusively that non-alignment is the safest policy. Normally speaking, a neutral country has no reason to fear any kind of aggression, and least of all, an armed aggression from any other country in the world. But then, both China and Pakistan have falsified that theory, not because it is a wrong theory, but because both Pakistan and China are equally mean and treacherous. Pakistan, on the pretext of the Kashmir dispute, attacked us, while China, on the

pretext of the Northern boundary question, stole a march against us when we were least prepared for such a treacherous stab on our back. Pakistan, ofcourse, is jealous of India's progress and advancement in the development of her various projects, while China is jealous of India's enviable position or status in Asia next to Russia's position in the East, and consequently, China wants always to damage or cripple India by setting back her economy, her industrial development, and even to disgrace or humiliate her in the eyes of the Eastern hemisphere by occupying forcibly some portion of her Northern boundaries. But then, India has learnt a lesson from both Pakistan and China ; she is no longer unprepared in her defence but doubly prepared to meet both the treacherous countries in an open warfare provided they are ready to accept India's genuine challenge to them ; otherwise India of herself will never seek any armed clash with Pakistan who had been India's younger brother for several centuries before the Partition of our country. So far China is concerned, if inspite of India's friendliness to her, she (China) wants to quarrel or fight with a friendly and neutral brother, India is ready to meet her in the open field with all the tactics or strategies of Mao Tse-tung, China's misguided leader, who has been digging the grave of China for the last three decades.

Gentlemen, a non-aligned country, unless she is disturbed by such mean, jealous and treacherous countries like Pakistan and China, can very nicely carry on her peaceful projects of scientific, industrial and technological development as many of the countries in the East and the West had been doing so far before they ceased to be non-aligned countries. There are very few countries in the world which are equally developed or prosperous like America and Russia ; hence, in order to maintain some amount of uniformity in the standard of material progress, it is absolutely necessary that most of the backward and under-developed countries should remain perfectly non-aligned so long they do not come up to the level of advancement and progress of America or Russia. Nehru used to say that it is the duty of every mighty and powerful country to help even other small, weak and under-developed country, and not to hinder her progress any way just as China is doing one way,

while America is doing another way, although the object of both is the same, namely, exploitation and expansion of power over the widest area in earth's surface. Nehru always used to say that unless and until the mightier nations are helpful to the weaker nations, there can not be any progress, harmony or peace in the world. This is very very true. That is why, gentlemen, I am strongly in favour of non-alignment whatever the speakers on the opposite side have to say.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, you must be aware that many of the critics have raised the question of Nehru's non-alignment policy particularly in connection with India's joining the Commonwealth of Nations and also the United Nations. They used to ask Nehru openly what kind of non-alignment was this membership of the two power blocs. Nehru said in reply that India had not entered into any military alliance or pact with any of these two groups just as Pakistan has done by being a member of the SEATO, NATO and CENTO, all of which are territorial defence organisations against China and Russia. Nehru was thoroughly honest in his own convictions, and he was also perfectly frank about them, not merely in preaching but also in practising them. He explained further his position that taking loans of food or of scientific and technical aid or even of financial aid from any country does not mean any alignment with that country. Alignment actually means military alliance and not alliance in trade or industries, in ethical or cultural missions. Nehru explained his position further before the world that India never accepted any kind of aid from any other country with any political string. Even at the present crisis of India when Pakistan and China are out to dislocate India's economy or to paralyse or set back all her development projects, India is declaring very openly and honestly that she is not prepared to receive any kind of aid from Britain, America or Russia or any other country with any political string. Nehru's successor Shastri has made India's stand on Kashmir perfectly clear, and so, there is no room for misunderstanding on any body's part to indulge in wishful thinking as America and Britain might be thinking that India will yield to the question,

of Kashmir and also to a favourable settlement of the problem with Pakistan, while Russia and China might be speculating that India is now in a tight corner, and therefore, she must either yield to the proposal for the Partition of Kashmir or for a complete surrender of Kashmir to Pakistan whether Kashmir has become an integral part of India or not. But the world should know that India will never agree to partition Kashmir or to surrender the entire State to Pakistan inspite of all temptations or threats from any corner of the world. India will always stand on her own legs and abide by the dictates of her own conscience. Gandhi like Nehru also believed in non-alignment because non-alignment keeps a country furthest away from violence, because non alignment means non interference with the affairs of other countries, and hence, it is more or less a policy or doctrine of peace, which has been always the aim of India and which should be the aim also of the world at large.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	70	out	of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	70	„	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	70	„	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	70	„	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	70	„	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	40	„	„	„	„

REVIEW

All the speakers have done exceptionally well except, ofcourse, the last speaker who instead of giving arguments have pointed out the effect of non-alignment upon international relations. It seems that most of the speakers were well-armed, well-informed and well-grounded on the subject, and that is why, they have done so well.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has much pleasure in congratulating all the speakers on their excellent performance. The Board hopes that the youths of India will, in the near future, get more interested in the problems of their mother country as they have evinced their interest in the present problem of non-alignment. The Board wishes that such important and interesting problems should be set from time to time for discussion before the candidates who are going to be officers of the Armed Forces.

Discussion No. 19

DO YOU THINK, NON-VIOLENCE IS PRACTICABLE IN ANY SPHERE OF HUMAN AFFAIRS ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, non-violence is practicable only in those spheres where there is no violence ; but to meet violence you must apply violence whatever may be the consequences. It is the height of stupidity to preach sermons of non-violence before dacoits, robbers, aggressive enemies and all sorts of criminals. Unless you are violent nobody will take you seriously. Even a child will not listen to your chastisement if you spare the rod. By using the rod you can make a child obedient, submissive, polite, truthful, dutiful, etc

It is a wrong idea that violence breeds violence just as hatred breeds hatred or love breeds love. On the contrary it is true to say that love often leads to hatred, friendliness breeds enmity, non-violence paves the way to violence. If India had not been preaching non-violence ever since she attained her political independence, neither Pakistan nor China would have dared attack India like that because they rightly thought that a country which believes in non-violence must be unprepared in her defences ; actually India was unprepared when China attacked her.

In the whole universe, there is nothing but the law of violence. The particles of the cosmic dust are continually arranging and disarranging themselves in order to maintain the equilibrium of the sun, the moon, the stars, the planets and

all sorts of heavenly bodies. Even in the kingdoms of nature on the surface of the earth, we find the operation of the law of violence everywhere e.g. the sun is continually evaporating the water of the sea into clouds, the clouds are pouring down into rains, the rains are swelling the rivers, the rivers are flowing into the sea, and again, the sea water is being evaporated into clouds. All these operations are definitely violent operations without which our life on earth would have been impossible. Then again, in the jungles, you find the beasts fighting with one another or pouncing upon one another, because without doing that they can not possible exist just as human beings also can not exist for a moment unless they kill the vegetables and the animals or apply violence even to the flowers and the fruits while collecting them for eating or for decorating themselves or their houses. How can we, therefore, say that non-violence is practicable in the human sphere particularly when we find everywhere else that violence is the universal law of existence? Those who will talk in favour of non-violence would be going against the laws of Nature. Human beings more than other creations of God have got in their very blood the instinct of violence, hatred or *himsa* and cruelty.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, may I like to know from my preceding speaker on what ground man claims his superiority over birds and beasts? Is it merely on the ground of intelligence, which many of the birds and beasts are found to possess e.g. the crow, the fox, the dog, the horse etc.? No, my dear friends, it is on the ground of self-restraint, self-control, self-sacrifice that man claims his superiority over all other creations. Many of my friends will say that the mother bird or the mother animal of every species sacrifices no less than the human mother for her young ones, and hence, wherein lies man's superiority over birds and beasts? It is in the power of self-control or self-restraint that man's real superiority over other creations of God lies. This self-restraint or self-control is found not only in the control of lust, jealousy, anger, etc. but also in returning love for hatred, frankness for suspicion, friendliness or trust for treachery as also non-violence for violence. Buddha, Christ

and Gandhi were the greatest apostles of non-violence or *ahimsa*. Do you mean to say that these greatest men of the world were all blind creatures and spoke untruths? Surely, not. It is man alone who is endowed with the power of non-violence and who alone can sacrifice himself for the sake of his fellow men and also control his anger, hatred and violence and give kindness, love and peace in their place

Gentlemen, just please consider how sweet and kind words can win the hearts even of the wicked cruel and revengeful spirits. So many criminals have been reformed by sweet words; so many unruly children have been corrected, not by chiding or reproaches but by sweet and loving words. Even the ferocious beasts in the jungle like lions and tigers, not to speak of other animals, have been found to be tamed by tender, loving or affectionate touches. Have you not seen how Vinoba Bhave brought round so many notorious dacoits and robbers by speaking to them nothing but sweet and kind words? Hence, if you still say that non-violence is not a practicable doctrine in the human sphere, I do not know how to convince you.

Third Speaker

But, gentlemen, may I like to know why even the most educated and cultured and civilized nations of the world have become so cruel and violent? It is these nations who brought about and waged the last two World Wars. It is U.S.A. which is the most progressive nation in the present-day world is carrying bombing ruthlessly in Viet-Nam. It was Germany and Britain, the most enlightened countries of Europe, three or four decades ago, who waged the most devastating wars; and if the third World War breaks out in near or distant future, it will be triggered surely by some of the most advanced nations of the world. And hence, I raise the question, how non-violence is the special quality of human beings or how it is a practicable doctrine in the human world particularly when nobody practises it except in words?

In my opinion, no quarrel, no dispute, no national or international problem can be solved except by force or violence. If Kennedy had not taken a stern attitude *i.e.* an attitude of

violence, I am sure, Khrushchev would have never withdrawn all the nuclear or non-nuclear weapons of war from Cuba, nor China would have cried a halt to her treacherous march against India if she had not been threatened with violence by U.S.A. and Russia. Even Pakistan, a pigmy, would not have learnt a lesson if India had not smashed all her Patton tanks and Sabre jets in the unprovoked conflict of 1965. Gandhi once said to a college girl that if she were threatened with an assault by a *goonda*, she should be most violent to him with whatever weapons she might be possessing at the moment. Gandhi believed in non-violence to the non-violent but in violence to the violent; and that is why probably many of the foreign critics have said that Gandhi's non-violence was a policy and not a creed; or in other words, Gandhi too believed in violence when violence was needed; otherwise he believed in non-violence. As a matter of fact, throughout the struggle of Indian freedom, Gandhi nowhere betrayed his violence against his enemy—the British Government, probably because he was genuinely afraid that if he led his country to a red revolution, she would only have a blood bath and no freedom in the hands of the British soldiers; and that is the whole truth about Gandhi's *Satyagraha* civil disobedience, non-co-operation and many other political movements which Gandhi launched in India as well as in South Africa.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I have not lost faith in non-violence although I know that in all kingdoms of nature, it is the law of violence that prevails, although human history tells me that man has been violent to his fellowmen through all the ages of barbarism and civilization. Non-violence is a divine virtue, discovered only by three greatest souls of the world—Buddha, Christ and Gandhi. Could man ever build up the family, or form any society or nation if he were essentially violent? His very co-existence with others proves conclusively that non-violence is the very secret of the law of preservation while violence is the way to destruction. You can try for yourself both violence and non-violence, and see the result of them on one and the same person. If you return kindness to unkindness, love to

hatred, friendliness to enmity, forgiveness to revenge, self-sacrifice to selfishness, you will positively succeed in winning even the brutes in the jungles, not to speak of winning the hearts of the human brutes in human society. In the human family if the husband or the wife, if the brother or the sister, if the parents or the children ran at the throat of each other just as the beasts do in the jungles, do you think, the family could grow up and not be torn to pieces long ages ago. The very fact that the family has been enlarged into a society and the society has been enlarged into a nation goes to prove that non-violence is the cementing force just like the law of gravitation that holds together all the heavenly bodies and even all the particles of cosmic dust of this mighty universe; otherwise the whole universe too would have gone to pieces. When you forgive a person who has done you some grave injury what do you notice in him? A guilty consciousness, a repentant spirit, and an attitude of submission which otherwise would never arise in the heart of an offender because every offender, even if he is positively wrong, thinks in his fits of anger, which is aroused by violence, that he is in the right, and consequently he can never realise the wrongness of his action. It is forgiveness or love or kindness or non-violence that makes a guilty person conscious of his guilt, and that is how he is slowly and gradually corrected in his evil doings. It is a wrong method to put a criminal behind the bars for a number of years and thereby convert him into a hardened criminal who can never correct himself afterwards. Every human being has a soul in him, unlike a brute, and it is this soul which actually feels the impact of non-violence and which helps him in realising his mistake or misdeed and in correcting it for the better. That is how non-violence works upon every human being. It sometimes works even upon a brute possibly because a brute also possesses something of a soul as we have found out that of all other animals, the dog and the horse, appear to be most susceptible to human affection, human love, human kindliness or tenderness, and that is why, there are innumerable instances of the dog and the horse saving their master's life at a critical moment or of lamenting bitterly the death of their master! There are, on the other hand, a few animals such as the elephant and the camel, who are

extremely patient and docile but if you treat them savagely, they will retaliate upon you with the fullest vengeance as it has been found in several cases how the elephant killed his own *Mahut* or guide and the camel too bit his own driver to death. It is said that the camel is the most vindictive animal, but then, if it is treated with love and kindness, it is the most docile animal like the elephant. So, gentlemen, if even the animals respond to non-violence, do you mean to say that human beings are incapable of responding to it ?

Fifth Speaker

I am afraid, gentlemen, my preceding speaker has cited wrong examples of the effect of non-violence upon men and brutes. I would yet refuse to believe that either the brutes or the human beings can be corrected without violence. If the criminals were not sent behind the bars, if some of them were not subjected to capital punishment, if the children were not beaten with the rod at home or in school, if the wild animals were not starved or given electric shocks in order to tame them, I am afraid, it would have been impossible to live in society always being surrounded by criminals, or to make anything out of the unruly children, or even to form any circus party of the wild animals for our common entertainment. It is only the burnt child that dreads the fire; similarly, it is only when a person is coerced or treated with violence that he comes to his senses. Does a man learn any lesson when he is bred and brought up in the lap of comfort and luxury ? Why do people say that poverty is a blessing ? Why do all teachers and parents say, spare the rod and spoil the child ? Why do all the expert criminal psychologists say that if you do not inflict the hardest punishment upon the foul criminals they will never turn a new leaf in their life ? If you take human beings collectively, and if you find them violent or unruly, the best way to tackle them is to apply violence to them just as the police make *lathi* charges, use tear gas, and even shower bullets on the unruly mob which will never listen to polite words or sermons of good behaviour. Even in the case of nations, if any of them threatens any other nation with violence, the best way to tackle such a nation is to smash it out with

violence as India did in 1965 in the case of Pakistan who made an unprovoked attack on Jammu and Kashmir.

In my opinion, gentlemen, non-violence is the creed of the cowardly or impotent persons, and not of the brave or the strong persons. Jesus Christ used to say that if you are smitten on one cheek you should lend your other cheek also ; but just consider to Christ in the long run. He was brutally crucified, and nobody could save him. Even Gandhi who preached and practised non-violence all his life was assassinated by one of his own countrymen. What is the good then of practising non-violence ? Have you ever heard of any nation bringing any other nation under any kind of control without violence ? If the Security Council of the United Nations had not sternly ordered for the cease fire, do you think, either India or Pakistan would have listened to any polite advice or request ? If the U.S.A.'s armed forces had not threatened Russia with violence, do you think, Russia would have stopped supplying all sorts of nuclear and non nuclear weapons to Cuba ? Certainly not. If Russia had not been strong or had not threatened violence with violence, I am sure, the whole of the Russian border on the Mongolian side would have been forcibly occupied by China just as China has forcibly occupied about twenty five thousand square miles of our Northern boundary. If U.S.A. and U.K. had threatened Pakistan or China with violence, could Pakistan dare give away a good portion of India's territory in Kashmir to China, or China could ever dare to accept it as a donation from Pakistan ? India has been preaching and also practising non-violence to some extent, and that is why, she lost a good portion of Kashmir in the hands of Pakistan and a long line of the Himalayan borders in the hands of China. There is a *sloka* in Sanskrit which says that one should be wicked to the wicked and violent to the violent, and it is only then, one can be saved from wickedness and violence.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, if violence could be of any avail, one war would not have been followed by another. You know the

history of Hundred Years' War between France and England ; you know also how the Infidels carried on their violent resistance against the Holy Crusade of the Christians for decades ; you know further that the first World War led to the Second World War because Germany could not forget or forgive the forced treaty of Versailles ; you are aware how violence between Hindus and Muslims led to the partition of India and is still producing communal disturbances in both Pakistan and India. Then again, you know how Mao Tse-tung's regime of violence and dictatorship has led finally to the Cultural Revolution and the Civil War in China. It may be that even Japan, who was under some kind of military occupation for a few years after the Second World War may burst into violence against U.S.A. and U.K. who forced her into submission. Even Egypt may rebel against the reign of President Nasser just as Cuba has revolted against U.S.A.'s militarism, or just as many of the States of Africa have rebelled against some of the European Powers that ruled over them with violence for centuries. India too rebelled against British rule but because of the outstanding personality of Gandhi, she could not burst into violence although the Sepoy Mutiny would testify to the contrary and Subhas Chandra Bose's I.N.A. is a living example of the reaction to the tyrannies of the British rule in India for nearly two centuries.

Ofcourse, I admit that non-violence cannot have a ready appeal to the brute world ; it appeals only to the self-disciplined people who have realised the moral and spiritual values of life. But how many individuals or nations in the modern world have realised such values ? Very few indeed, because the practice of non-violence is a very difficult task. Self-indulgence is an easy thing but self-restraint is a difficult task ; one is the line of least resistance while the other is the line of greatest resistance. Every body can easily burst into anger, can play the victim to drinking, gambling and other vices ; every body can easily do injuries to others but how many can subdue his anger ? How many can resist the temptation of drinking or gambling ? How many can forgive the faults of others ? How many can extend love, friendliness in return of hatred and enmity ? Very few indeed ; and that is why, most people

cannot realise the value of non-violence. Ofcourse, the brute instinct is present almost in every human being, and hence, it will take centuries and ages to conquer that brute instinct ; but it does not mean on that account that non-violence is an impracticable thing. Like *brahmacharya*, non-violence is a very hard course of self-discipline, and it can not be practised or acquired by any and every body.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	70	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	50	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	70	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	70	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	70	„	„	„

REVIEW

All the candidates seem to have done equally well except that the second speaker and the third speaker have given fewer arguments than other speakers but that does not take away the value of their argumnets. It is striking that both the sides have given quite logical and convincing arguments in favour of violence as well as of non-violence, although the arguments on the side of non-violence are fewer in number just as good things are fewer than bad things.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board notices with regret that some of the speaker seem to be strongly prejudiced in favour of violence although all of them belong to the land of Gandhi who was the greatest apostle of non-violence. Ofcourse, it goes to the credit as well of the those who have spoken in favour of violence because these candidates are going to be officers of the Armed Forces in order to defend their country against any aggressor. A soldier should always believe in violence because he has got to meet violence with violence ; but a civilian should always believe in non-violence because he has got to live peacefully with his fellowmen.

Discussion No. 20

WHO IS THE BEST GUIDE IN LIFE—THE TEACHER, THE PARENT OR THE FRIEND ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, in my opinion, teacher is the best guide because he helps his pupil in enlarging his knowledge, in improving his morals, in taking care of his body by initiating him to games and sports or to any other kind of physical exercise, and also in infusing into him the spiritual aspect of human life. As a matter of fact, an ideal teacher is expected to take care of the intellectual, moral, spiritual and physical side of his pupil's life, and that how he plays the most important role in the lives of young children or youths.

The father or the mother can not take any other care of their children except bringing them up at home ;—the father takes care of the children by earning money and spending it on their maintenance and education, while the mother takes care of their food and clothes. Ofcourse, the educated parents sometimes take care also of the studies of their children ; but then, the father has little spare time for the purpose after his office work, and the mother too being constantly busy with household work cannot give much time to the studies of her children.

Then again, the father can not play the role of a friend to his children as the teacher possibly can. The relation between parents and children is one of respectful attitude and respectable

distance, and hence, the children can never hold any intimate talk with their parents. There are certain things or rather problems of adolescence which growing children can not discuss with any body else except with intimate friends or teachers ; and even teachers also, if they are aged, can not have any intimate talk with their pupils on certain delicate topics such as love, sex, marriage, puberty etc. That is why, from all points of view, the teacher is the best companion, guide, friend to his pupil. A pupil can confess anything to his teacher, and the teacher also discuss every thing openly with his pupil.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker has no idea of the modern teacher who is so indifferent to the affairs of his pupil, who is also so corrupt, and sometimes so incompetent that he should be last person to be consulted by his pupil in any of the questions of his welfare in life. The modern teacher, atleast in our country, never cares to enquire about the studies or health or economic condition or about any other problem of his pupil ; and naturally, the pupil has to walk further and further away from his teacher. The intimate relationship which used to exist between the teacher and the taught in ancient days no more exists now-a-days ; and hence, the pupil can derive no benefit from his teacher. On the other hand, the modern teacher is a corruptor of his pupil, because he initiates him to many of the vices such as smoking, drinking, going to the pictures, to the brothel, to the gambling den etc. The modern teacher sometimes takes an undue advantage of his pupil by initiating him to some of the most unnatural and pernicious habits of sex-perversion such as masturbation, sodomy etc which once contracted can not be easily given up. How can such a teacher be a guide, friend and philosopher to his pupil ?

In my opinion, a friend is the best guide to a growing child or youth because a true friend, if he is fairly intelligent or educated, can help him a lot in various ways *e.g.* in studies, in building up health and character, in initiating him to good hobbies, as well as in shaping his life and career. Friends

alone can do the greatest service to friends. You can open your heart to your friend and disclose all your secrets, or discuss all your intimate problems which you cannot possibly do with your venerable teachers or parents. The relation between friends is the closest and also the most selfless relation, and that is why, everything can be confided between them. Very few of the children confide the secrets of their heart to their parents or teachers because both parents and teachers are looked upon with awe *i.e.* with fear and reverence. There can not be any frank exchange of thoughts, ideas or feelings between two persons if there is any fear or reverence between them. Can you talk of your love affairs or your sex problems to your parents or teachers? Certainly not. You can discuss these problems with your friends only because you and your friend are practically of the same age; but there is a lot of difference in age between parents and children, between teachers and pupils.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker has talked too highly of friends; but in my view, parents alone can be the best guide, chiefly because parents are the most selflessly interested in the welfare of their children, and also because they have the greatest opportunity of coming in closest touch with their children. Ofcourse, some of the parents keep themselves unduly aloof from their children, particularly the father keeps most aloof, while the mother is quite intimate with all her children. But most parents do not keep aloof from their children; and hence, they can watch, study, examine the problems of their children which the children themselves also can reveal to their parents in order to find out their popular solutions

From the moral and the spiritual points of view, there is no doubt that parents can be the best guide to their children because no parents in the world would ever misguide their own children morally or spiritually. They may not be able to guide them in their studies in all cases but they can surely build up their character, improve their health, and also make them

religious-minded and spiritually-inclined, It is because of the missing touch between parents and children that most children are becoming ! anti-religious and even anti-theistic, and also morally degraded. If the parents took sufficient care of their children in all these directions, the children could never go wrong, could never take part in rowdyism, hooliganism or vandalism, could never become such a great public nuisance as they have really become these days.

Parents are the greatest well-wishers of their children ; no teacher or friend can be such a well-wisher because a teacher is a mercenary creature ; he is paid for all the care he is likely to take of his pupil ; and hence, his interest in the pupil can not be selfless. Even a friend, unless he is really a true friend, can not but be a self-interested friend. A friend in need is undoubtedly a friend indeed but how many in the world can be true friends ? Very few indeed. Most friends are just like summerflies who come for fulfilling their own interest. We know of thousands of instances in which so-called friends have betrayed their friends, in which faithless friends have only exploited their intimate companions and have also initiated them to various vices from which there can not be any return in one's life-time. That is why, I say, friends of today are most dangerous creatures ; they should better be kept at an arm's length ; it is better not to have any friend at all rather than to have a bad, corrupt, morally degraded and treacherous friend. I personally do not believe in friends at all ; I consider them as really dangerous. I would rather depend on my parents for my guidance all my life. I have found out, as you must have also done, that teachers and friends are not at all reliable.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker has done the greatest injustice to friends, probably because he must be unfortunate enough not to have any friend in the world. A friend, in my opinion, is not merely a teacher and a guide but he often proves to be a saviour. I know of so many friends who jumped into fire and water in order to save the life of their

friend. I know of other friends who in acute distress preserved the life of their friend by lending money, food, clothes, shelter and whatever else he needed. I know of many other friends who at the time of illness of their friend attended the sickbed day and night without a wink of sleep and sometimes forgetting their food and drink. I know of a few friends who corrected the bad habits of their friend in drinking, gambling, smoking and even in being a frequent visitor to public brothels. They say that once you get into any of these vicious habits, no power on earth can reform you ; it is undoubtedly true ; but a friend alone can turn you away from such vices and save you from ruin. In spite of all these glaring examples, if anybody says that a friend is not the best guide in the world, I would say that he is blind, and he can not distinguish between light and darkness !

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, the above speaker must be prejudiced in favour of friends, and that is why, he has talked so highly of them. He is not aware what traitors modern friends and modern teachers are ; he has no idea how one who approaches in the garb of a friend is merely a wolf in sheep's skin or a snake with a flowery tongue, and who as such wins the hearts of young boys and young men and women. In the modern world, there is nobody who is not self-interested, and it is impossible for any body to be a true or honest friend to any body. In schools, colleges and universities we find daily how certain boys or youngmen profess to be friends to the sons of rich parents and not to the sons of poor parents because they know that by sticking to such persons they can thrive in various ways—*e.g.* in getting sumptuous feeds at the restaurants, coffee houses ; in seeing pictures as frequently as ever ; in smoking, drinking and sometimes in visiting public brothels or in running after respectable girls—the college or the university girls—who can be secured only by such temptations as motor drives, picture shows and sumptuous feeds ! Now-a-days, friends are no friends but they are sharks, blood-suckers, traitors and great enemies.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	60	„ „ „ „		
Third Speaker	„	65	„ „ „ „		
Fourth Speaker		40	„ „ „ „		
Fifth Speaker		45			

REVIEW

None of the candidates has fared well although some of the speakers have put forward one or two good arguments. Then again, the discussion has been unusually cut short due to the absence of competitors although as many as fifteen candidates appeared at the interview. Is the topic for discussion too stale, too uninteresting? Whatever may be case, performance is rather disappointing.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board regrets that out of fifteen candidates, only five took part in the discussion. It seems, the batch is unusually shy or backward. Whatever may be the cause, it is one of the poorest shows put up before the Services Selection Board!

Discussion No. 21

IS SCIENCE A BLESSING OR A CURSE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, science can never be a curse ; it can only be a blessing because on the one hand, it widens human knowledge while on the other, it relieves pain and suffering of the distress and at the same time, it adds to the comfort and recreation of mankind. Just consider for a moment how blind man was when science was not discovered. The whole universe seemed to be a dust-haze, and every thing seemed to be enveloped in mystery ! Did not our forefathers worship the sun, the moon and the stars as gods or goddesses ? Did they not believe in nymphs, *dryads* (wood nymphs), *Naiads* (river nymphs), angels, cherubs, devils, hobgoblins, ghosts and all sorts of fanciful creatures which exist only in the imagination of superstitious minds. What are the pantheons of Greek or Hindu gods and goddesses ? They are nothing but fanciful creations of the blind human brains that have not received the light of science. As a matter of fact, even God as the creator of the universe, agents of retribution—the furies or Nemesis—all sorts of unnatural beings such as half-human and half-lion, half-goat and half-human, unicorns, etc all are figments of the unenlightened human brains. The very idea that the earth stands on the heads of seven big serpents or that it came out of a big egg shell parted into two or that the sun came out because Jesus Christ said, "Let there be light" etc. all are absurd conceptions which have been persisting still all over the world—enlightened or unlightened. But then, one who is a scientist or

a student of science can never believe in such nonsensical things because he depends entirely on the testimony of the five senses, and any thing is corroborated by the five senses, he is not prepared to accept as a fact or a truth ! How many millions of people all over the world have been believing from the very dawn of the human race in all sorts of supernatural beings but science does not admit any such stuff, and hence, in the eyes of a student of science, all supernatural beings including ghosts, angels, cherubs, fairies, etc. are nothing but figments of the ignorant brain *i.e.* unscientific brain.

So, it is science which has worked as the eye opener to mankind. If man had not discovered science, he would have been still lingering on the level of the brutes because what is after all the difference between an animal and a human being ? Not surely, the shape or form or the physical appearance, in which practically there is not much of difference between an animal and a human being. If an animal could stand or walk on its hind legs and if it could discard its tail there would be very little difference between the two ! But then, the real difference lies in the mind which is possessed only by a human being, and this mind develops only at the touch of knowledge which is contributed only by science and not so much by any of the arts—language or history or economics or geography or any other such subject of study. Science analyses everything in this universe, from the dust particles to the sun, the moon and the stars ! Science analyses the leaves, the plants, the flowers, the fruits, the roots and branches of trees, the insects, the flies, the reptiles and all sorts of creatures that live on land, in water and in the air ; and it tries to discover the secrets of their life. There are so many branches of science now-a-days *e.g.* physics, mathematics, chemistry, biology, zoology, botany, geology, astronomy, medicine, surgery, pharmacology, metallurgy, meteorology, psychology, psychiatry, neurology, pedagogy, astrology, biochemistry, anatomy, physiology, etc. Many of the arts are also considered as sciences, or rather the scientific aspect of some of the arts has been treated separately, and that is why, we now-a-days call politics as political science, psychology as mental science, anthropology as the origin of man, music as the science of notations, geography as the science

of the seas and the oceans, and even theology as the science of religion.

Before science came into existence, we knew nothing about the mysteries of this universe, and hence, we were as blind as the animals or the birds in the jungles. So, science has made man a demi-god, and some people go to the length of believing that science has brought out the god in man or the power of knowledge which is the privilege of God only—the creator of the universe. It is impossible to enumerate all the things which science has discovered or invented just as it is equally impossible to enumerate the living and the non-living things in this universe. I can only say this much that science is the greatest blessing to mankind because it has enlarged human knowledge, added to human comforts, relieved human distress to such an extent. To dilate on the blessings of science would take quite a long time which can not possibly be granted to such a formal group discussion in which we are participating at this moment.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, science is not at all a blessing but a positive curse because it has increased the wants of life, made living much costlier than before; further, science by developing various industries has sharply divided the human population into two main classes—the capitalists and the labourers. The capitalists represent the moneyed class while the labourers represent the poor class. The capitalists are the exploiting class while the labourers are the exploited class. This distinction has given rise to capitalism on the one hand, and communism on the other. Both capitalism and communism have created a great tension in the modern world. The problem of labour *versus* capital has been complicated further by politics because politics is casting its shadow over every affair of human life and making every problem most difficult to solve.

Superficially speaking, science has undoubtedly enlarged human knowledge but the question is how that knowledge is being utilized now-a-days by man. Is it for the benefit or service of humanity or for its destruction or distress. Honestly

speaking, science has done nothing but made many non-essential things essential, many unnecessary things as necessary and indispensable, and thereby it has added to our misery and not at all to our comfort. For example, what was the need of motor cars, electric fans, electric lights, frigidier, electric heater or cooler, cinema, radio etc. All these articles are articles of luxury and can be enjoyed only by those who are rich; but how many of us are rich like that? Eighty per cent of our population are poor villagers who live in mud houses and thatched cottages, and who seldom get two square meals a day; and that is why, Gandhi was so much against industrialisation of our country. Gandhi believed in decreasing the wants of life, he actually set up an ideal before the whole world how simple human life can be with one piece of cloth for the lower limbs and another piece for the upper limbs, and for food and drink, only vegetables, rice and wheat and water should be regarded as enough. Ofcourse, those who can maintain cows and buffalos at home can also drink milk which is the most nourishing food in the world. With all such simplicity of living, Gandhi was one of the most cultured men on earth. He did not take the help even of medical science while treating his own illness or the illness of others but he depended on his own natureopathy, which is nothing but a system of nature cure. He believed in natural food and natural ways of living, and that is why, he wanted to be furthest away from science which has made our living extremely artificial and difficult.

Then again, if we look to the other side of science we find how science has made man anti-religious and anti-theistic or atheistic. Most people in the progressive countries now a-days do not believe at all in any religion or even in God. This is a dangerous tendency because it leads to moral degeneration. If you do not believe in religion or in God, you become a regular brute because you believe that no power on earth can curb you in any of your wicked or vulgar ambitions. This attitude of perfect independence of any power or authority makes one reckless, irresponsible, cruel, unjust, and that is what man has become now-a-days inspite of all education, light and

culture. Science, therefore, is not only a curse but a regular menace to the moral and spiritual progress of man.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, my immediately preceding speaker has pointed out certain evils which are definitely not the evils of science. Whether there was any science or not some people were already atheistic, irreligious and immoral, while in spite of the highest and most extensive developments of science and industries millions of people are still staunch believers in God and also in various forms of religion such as Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, Sikhism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism etc. Religion and morality have nothing to do with science because many of the profound scientists are still greatest believers in God and religion, and they are also fair, just, kind-hearted, loving and generous to their fellow beings. Every human being has two elements in him—one element that inclines him to obedience, temperance, justice while the other element tempts him to be reckless, revolutionary and defiant. Science has nothing to do with any of these two elements. On the other hand, science makes one all the more reasonable, considerate, sound in judgment, shrewd in observation and even sympathetic in his views and attitude to fellow beings. Hence, my preceding speaker's allegations are all baseless and false. It is not science which has given rise to Communism or its clash with capitalism, but on the other hand, it is man's greed for power and wealth which has led to the creation of the capitalist class, while the poverty and backwardness of the working class have led to the threats of communism which is absolutely a fantastic theory of life and which cannot be supported on any ground. Communism is the reflex of inferiority complex while capitalism is the reflex of superiority complex both of which complexes are inherent in human nature and they can be curbed, not by abolishing science but by encouraging science so that every section of the human population may be raised to a certain standard level—the level of thinking, feeling and living. The human world has been unbalanced because of the unusual progress in light and culture of the Western world and of the extreme backwardness of the Eastern World. If we can some day or other bring the two worlds

to the same level of light and culture we shall find that the distinction between capitalism and communism has totally disappeared.

Gentlemen, I am for science because science means enlightenment, material progress, prosperity, power of control, not over human beings but over all other living and non-living things. Is it not a rare privilege of man if he can be the master of everything in the universe as he is going to be soon the conqueror of the moon and also of other planets? Do not say, gentlemen, that to probe into the mysteries of the universe is an evil in itself; this curiosity for knowing the unknown is a noble curiosity, and it must not be discouraged. Ofcourse, this curiosity should be always directed to some human good and not to any human evil.

What science has done so far is really an incalculable good. What do you think of the railway engine, the steam ship, the air craft, the telephone, the telegraph, the wireless, the motor car, and so many other means of conveyance and communication? Are they not all blessings to mankind? How poor, wretched, helpless man was before the advent of science! He did not know even how to cook his food because he had not then invented fire? How defenceless he was against the wild animals and even against his own fellowmen who were worse than wild beasts! But with the discovery or invention of gunpowder he became perfectly safe against all his enemies. Ofcourse, it would lie with man when to use gunpowder or not; and if he happens to abuse it at any time, it would be his fault and not of the gunpowder!

Science has been accused of raising our standard of living or rather making our living much costlier than before. But what does it matter? Should we be eternally contented with the loin cloth, the mud house and the thatched cottage? Should we not enjoy better houses, more comfortable living, and some of the articles of convenience and ease? Should we not have any kind of recreation or enjoyment? Should we only work and not play sometimes? What is wrong with the cinema? What is wrong with the theatre? What is wrong with the dancing-hall? What is wrong with the various

games and sports which science has invented ? I think, there is nothing wrong with any of them. It is only our wrong way of thinking which makes all things of science as wrong, as unnecessary and undesirable.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, how can we believe that science is not a positive evil when it has invented so many destructive weapons of war ? Do you mean to say that all nuclear weapons are blessings ? If conventional war can produce such havoc upon life and property as it did during the last two World Wars, you can well imagine what devastation a nuclear war will work, as it did to some extent, when only one small atom bomb was thrown in Hiroshima and Nagasaki—the two neighbouring islands of Japan. Do you mean to say that a thing which is capable of working so much of devastation should not be regarded as an evil ? Well, I do not know what else should be regarded as an evil if science is not regarded as such.

Dr Johnson said that a politician is the greatest scoundrel ; should we not say that a scientist is the greatest enemy of mankind ? The competition for such devastation is going on among the scientists of various countries ever since the beginning of the first World War ; but earlier than that science contributed more to the welfare than to the illfare of humanity. Now that science is joined with politics—twin devils of the human brain—far worse havoc and devastation are ahead, and it may quite happen that science will ultimately bring about the complete annihilation of the human species. Do you mean to say that some day or other either Russia or U.S.A. or even China may not trigger the long-feared nuclear war and wipe out half of the entire human population in a minute from the face of the earth ? Would you still regard science as a blessing when science has created such diabolical engines of destruction ?

Then again, even if we take the more peaceful aspect of science, we find that it is far more destructive than constructive. Just consider for a moment the innumerable accidents which take place in the workshops, factories, mills, on the roads, in the air due to the crash of the aircrafts or the breakdown of

some machinery or due to the wrong handling of the various engines by man. Do you mean to say the destruction of certain precious lives is nothing as compared with the services of science? I am not prepared to accept it as that. It is better to be ignorant and blind and be serviceable to one's fellowmen rather than to be armed with the secret weapons of destruction to be applied only for purposes of destruction! Some people argue that science has done more good than evil but how I have not yet been convinced. If science has invented nuclear weapons for the destruction of the human species, if science has invented the railway engine, the motor car, the jet plane only to multiply the number of risks of life and property, how can we say that science is more a blessing than a curse?

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, we are nothing but short sighted animals when we say that science is all a curse and not a blessing at all. I want to know from you who has minimised our physical pain, physical discomfort and physical exhaustion? Who has discovered or invented the remedies for the foul and incurable diseases? Who has given relief to the patient who has broken any of his limbs in the battle field or by accident? Who has made longest journeys much shorter, much easier and much more convenient than before? Who has built such secure and comfortable shelters for us against sun and shower? Who has discovered so many varieties of food and drink which we enjoy from day to day? Who has improved our agriculture? Who has set up the embankments against floods? Who has discovered or invented the various insecticides which destroy human food, human clothes and human dwelling-places? Who has fertilized the sterile lands? Who has made tunnels through mountains? Who has unearthed the richest minerals of the soil which we use for various purposes? Who has added to the wealth of the world? Who has contributed to the recreation and pleasures of mankind? Who has put us into interstellar space? Who has made us travel into such incredible heights and at such an incredible speed? Who has converted sterile lands into smiling greens? Who has made us the master of many of the elements of Nature at whose mercy we had been since the beginning of our

creation ? Who has economised our labour and time and all kinds of expenses ? Who has brought us nearer to all corners of the world ? It is the scientist and no other man ; and yet we are ungrateful enough to blame the scientist who has made a god of man, a man of beast, and an angel of the devil !

Sixth Speaker

But, gentlemen, while praising science, we are overlooking the great injuries which science has done to us. Has not science made us unduly proud, unduly greedy of power and wealth, unduly cruel and regardless of the pains and miseries of our fellowmen ? Has not science helped us in exploiting the backward and under-developed countries and in extending our political and economic supremacy over them ? On whose strength U S A. is playing such havoc in Viet-Nam ? It is on the strength of the nuclear weapons which science has invented and it is also on the strength of wealth which science has added to the coffers of U S A., because it is science which has developed so tremendously U S A.'s trade and industries without which U S A. would have been as poor as India or Africa or China. So, it is science which is at the root of all exploitation, tyranny, cruelty, enmity, hatred. How can we regard such a thing as a blessing ?

Seventh Speaker

Gentlemen, we are doing the greatest injustice to science when we are attributing so many evils to it which we should rather attribute to politics, economics, sociology, and modern civilization. No scientist in the world would ever work for the destruction of mankind unless he is instigated by the politician. In both Russia and U S A. the scientists have been manufacturing nuclear weapons at the point of the gun or the bayonet of the government of these governments. We should know that immediately after the termination of the Second World War, both Russia and U.S A. managed to kidnap some of the best scientists of Germany and forced them to carry on with their nuclear researches with a view to invent the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb, the cobalt bomb, the nitrogen bomb, the intercontinental-ballistic missiles with which one can hit

the target at a distance of thousands of miles and devastate countries or continents by setting fire on the surrounding atmosphere or by releasing the thermal power and thereby melting the ice in the North or the South Pole. It may be that some scientist may work under the temptation of millions of pounds or dollars for the manufacture of such destructive weapons but then, most of the scientists are selfless workers for the advancement of human knowledge and for the services of mankind, and not for doing any kind of injury even to the tiniest creatures. Therefore, it would be wrong on our part to think that the scientists out of their own initiative have invented so many nuclear weapons for the destruction of mankind.

Science has been always beneficial to mankind. The accidents which follow from the various machines on land or in water or in the air are beyond the control of science, and therefore, science should not be held responsible for them. Even without science and before science came into existence, millions of human beings used to be killed by epidemics of plague, cholera, small pox and also by other foul and chronic diseases such as malaria, typhoid fever, dysentery, tuberculosis ; but now-a days, after the discovery or invention of the various anti biotics, most of these foul and devastating diseases have been almost completely eradicated. The inoculation of certain vaccines into the human system before the outbreak of most of the epidemic diseases is a sure preventive of these mortal diseases. Nobody formerly could escape from death as the victim of plague or tuberculosis or small pox or even of typhoid fever ; but now-a-days, these diseases have become most harmless because of the discovery and invention of the various anti-biotics. Formerly, even the extraction of a tooth was so painful, and any kind of surgical operation used to be dreaded like anything ; but now-a-days, due to the advancement of science, nobody feels any pain under the surgeon's knife, nobody feels nervous or fears that he will positively die on the operation table ; but on the other hand, most difficult and prolonged operations are being performed in every good and well-equipped hospitals in the world, and the surgeons are giving new eyes, new heart, new lungs to the patients who

would otherwise grow perfectly blind or die of heart failure or of diseased and crippled lungs. Are not all these wonders of science for the service of mankind? Why should we then consider science as a curse and not as a blessing? Gentlemen, whoever has spoken against science here in this debate or discussion wants to be deliberately blind.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures 75 out of 100 marks				
Second Speaker	„	70	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	80	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	65	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	55	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	50	„	„	„
Seventh Speaker	„	70	„	„	„

REVIEW

Most of the speakers have done admirably well. All the arguments advanced in favour of science are almost irrefutable, logical and sound; and even some of the arguments against science are equally irrefutable, logical and sound; and hence, the opposition between the two parties is well-balanced.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board notices with pleasure that the youths of our country are more in favour of science than against it. India badly needs scientific and industrial developments. Even Mahatma Gandhi was not against science, but then, he was prejudiced against the heavy industries which Nehru had been espousing strongly throughout his regime, and that is why, India today has made considerable progress in science and industries. The modern age is the age of science and industries, and if we want to survive, we must march with the times.

Discussion No. 22

IS THE EXAMINATION SYSTEM A TRUE TEST OF MERIT ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, in the absence of any other test how can we say that the examination system is not the true test of merit ? We can not distinguish much between the written test and the oral test, because they are both the same method of putting questions and getting answers in order to evaluate the respective merits of the candidates who appear at any examination—Services Competitive examination or university examination. From the times of yore the examination system has been going on till today, and no other better method of testing the merits of candidates has been discovered so far. Even in the Western countries, the test is the same, the method is the same with some slight difference here and there. In the Western countries, you have got the tutorial system. A student has to work under a tutor for the complete course of his studies (may be for two or three years), and it is the tutor who has to award marks on the work done from week to week or from month to month by the student. The tutor is supposed to be on an intimate touch with the progress of his pupil's work as well as with the development of his pupil's brain, and as such, the tutor is the best person to certify the deficiency or the efficiency of his pupil. Then comes the written examination in which all students for the same course of studies participate. The answer books of each examinee are evaluated by various examiners to whom the examinee is not supposed

to be known any way; and hence, such evaluation is expected to be impartial, just and fair unlike the evaluation of the pupil by his tutor who may be prejudiced in favour or against the pupil. Next comes the *viva voce* or oral test, which is also held by a body of examiners to whom also the examinees are not supposed to be known; and hence, here too, the evaluation is expected to be fair, just and free from partiality. Hence, I personally believe that the examination system is the best possible test of merit particularly when no other test is in sight.

Second Speaker

But, gentlemen there are certain handicaps of the examination system I would like to place those handicaps before you so that you may be able to judge how far I am justified in not being in favour of the examination system at all. There are various defects in each of the systems. Let me, first of all, point out the following defects of the tutorial system which also comes under the examination system :—

(1) In our country, particularly, the tutorial system can never be just, fair and impartial, because the tutors are themselves corrupt. In order to maintain his job in the college or in the university, the tutor has to award as many marks as possible to his pupils, whether they deserve it or not, in order to show good results.

(2) The Indian tutor is often bribed by his pupils either with cash or with occasional feeds at the restaurants or with picture shows at the cinema houses or with some costly presents such as a radio set or a cooler or some such article.

(3) In foreign countries also the tutor is similarly bribed but in India, the tutor is far more corrupt than in the western countries. The Indian tutor does not regularly or properly attend the work of his pupils and yet he awards them atleast pass marks so that his own job may be secure in the college or in the university.

(4) The Indian tutor is found in many cases as incompetent to judge the real merit of his pupils' work chiefly

because he does not take sufficient pains to study the subject connected with his pupils' work, and naturally, his evaluation of the work of his pupils is wrong in most cases.

(5) Sometimes the tutor is prejudiced against some of his pupils for some reasons or other due to some private grudge against them or due to his own bad temper or ill-humour. Naturally, in the hands of such a tutor, no fair evaluation of work can be expected.

Gentlemen, you should now note the following defects of the written test : —

1. The examinees generally prepare a limited number of expected questions on their subject out of the help-books which are available in the market. They mug up the answers to these questions and reproduce them in their answer books. Naturally, such a preparation can never be considered as adequate, and hence, the marks which they secure in the hands of the examiners are not proper either way.

2. The time allotted for the written test in the examination hall is sometimes too short for doing justice to all the questions which are set in any particular paper or subject.

3. Some of the examinees get nervous in the examination hall and, therefore, they often spoil their answers even knowing them correctly.

4. In our country, there is often a mass-scale of copying from books in the examination hall under the very nose and eyes of the invigilators who connive at such unfair means partly because they are sometimes heavily bribed while at other times they are afraid of being roughly handled by the examinees outside the examination hall. There have been several cases of such rough handling in many of our colleges and universities.

5. The appointment of examiners in our country is not always fair ; it is mostly manipulated through the back door by personal influence ; and hence, it is not always the competent persons who are appointed as examiners ; and hence, the examinees suffer in their hands

6. Then again, the appointed examiners do not generally mark the answer books partly because they accept too many answer books for various examinations which they can not do according to rules ; but personal influence can brush aside such rules of examinership. Such examiners get most of the answer books examined or marked by most incompetent persons who neither possess any requisite academic qualification nor are they any way connected with the subject of the paper on which they award marks. What happens as the result of all this is that good students often go down in their place or even fail at the examination, while bad students go up and secure marks which they do not deserve at all.

There are certain defects also of the *viva voce* or the oral test such as the following :—

1. All students are not equally bold or forward to face the *viva voce* test. Some of the examinees are extremely shy and also nervous. How can such candidates fare well inspite of their sound knowledge or preparation ?

2. It is difficult to answer any and every question fully in a *viva voce* test. Some amount of thinking is sometimes necessary for answering a difficult question. Then again, all students are not equally ready-minded although they may be well-grounded in their subject of study.

3. The examiners at the *viva voce* test are often influenced through the back door by certain students, and hence, awarding of marks can not be always necessarily fair.

4. Indian examiners at the *viva voce* test particularly of the Services Competitive examination, which is held by the Public Service Commission, often put silly questions for which intelligent candidates are never prepared.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, you have listened to the arguments of the second speaker who has pointed out many defects of the examination system but which fortunately are not the real defects. What the second speaker has alleged against the tutors, the written test examiners or the *viva voce* test examiners.

is not at all true. The honourable speaker must be either ill-informed or must be prejudiced in his mind for reasons best known to himself. I do not think, the Public Service Commission can be corrupt, or that every tutor in the college or in the university can be so morally degraded, or that the examiners of the written test get the answer books examined by unqualified or incompetent hands. The speaker in question here has made a wholesale charge of corruption against the educational authorities and even against the Public Service Commission, which is indeed an absolutely unjustifiable, baseless and false charge to which no sensible person can give any credence.

I am in favour of the Examination system chiefly because it is the only best way of testing the merits of the examinees, and partly also because no other alternative test or method or system has yet been discovered

Gentlemen, the examination system, as has been already pointed out, consists of three stages—the tutorial system, the written test and the oral test. These three stages should be considered as more than a sufficient safeguard against all possible flaws, deficiencies, or defects. If a certain candidate suffers at the first stage, may be able to make up his loss at the second and the third stages; or if he is unlucky enough to suffer at two stages, he can possibly make up his loss at the third stage. Hence, from all points of consideration, the examination system is the best system of testing merits.

Fourth Speaker.

Gentlemen, with all the arguments put forward in favour of the Examination system, I am strongly of opinion that the Examination system is the worst system and that it can never be the true test of merit for the following reasons :—

1. The examination system encourages nothing but cramming because most of the examinees merely mug up things from books and vomit them into their answer books in the examination hall.

2. The examination system leaves no scope for originality in thinking, expression or argument or in any other form.

3 The examination system is a time-honoured system and it has become hackneyed, stale and out-worn ; it has, therefore, got a tedious, monotonous effect upon the examinees.

4 If due to illness or any other mischance, one misses the examination on a particular date, he misses the bus or his life itself for ever because one may be too poor to meet the examination fees repeatedly.

5. In order to test real merit, one should be subjected to some practical test just as the science students have to make certain experiments in the laboratory in order to prove their knowledge of their subject of study.

6. So far the arts subjects or humanities are concerned, there can be also practical examinations which would be in the form of an oral test to be held by teachers of other universities in our own country or in certain foreign universities.

7. Merit means not merely the power of reproduction but the power of original thinking and expression. A candidate may have a gigantic memory and may, like the parrot, reproduce every syllable of what he reads or hears ; but that is not the true stamp of merit. One should, on the other hand, have a new outlook, a new angle, a new view-point by which one's real merit should be judged.

8. Most of the graduates and post-graduates of our universities forget everything about their respective subjects of study as soon as they walk out of the examination hall, which means, they read and memorise things without understanding. What credit can you give to such scholarship ?

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	40	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	70	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	40	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	50	„	„	„

REVIEW

It seems that only one speaker has done well ; he is head and shoulders above all other speakers ; his arguments are sound and perfectly true. The arguments of other speakers are flimsy and also somewhat baseless or unauthentic. On the whole, the performance of the speaker is a poor show indeed.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board regrets to notice that except one speaker every body else has cut an extremely poor figure. The reason may be that very few are interested in the present topic of discussion or because no solid argument can be pressed against the age-old examination system. It is further noticeable that out of twelve candidates, only four have participated in the discussion, and hence, the Board feels rather shocked at the poor preparedness of the candidates who came for an interview before the Services Selection Board.

Discussion No. 23

WHICH WOULD YOU PREFER AND WHY—LOVE MARRIAGE OR ARRANGED MARRIAGE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, we are living in a world of freedom, and particularly, of sex freedom, and therefore, I would always prefer love marriage to arranged marriage. In my opinion, arranged marriage is no marriage at all because it is settled by guardians who look to the profit part of it than to the sentimental part. After all, I do not believe in any kind of marriage through the eyes of others. I must see my own partner, examine her, study her and judge her also how far she would be suitable to me as my life's companion. It is only the blind people who want to see things through borrowed eyes or through the eyes of others. Marriage is not a *tamasha* or a relationship of a few moments or of a few days only ; it is a life-long tie ; and although there is room for divorce yet I personally do not believe in changing partners unless one of the two dies in young age.

Love marriage. in my opinion, is the best form of marriage ; it is a marriage based on freedom—freedom of choice on the part of both the partners, and therefore, it is an ideal form of marriage. I wonder sometimes how and why our Hindu ancestors preferred arranged or negotiated marriage—probably because in those early days, early marriage or rather child marriage was the fashion ; and in such marriages, how can children exercise their choice when they do not know the A, B, C, of marriage. For the children, for the blind, for

the crippled, arranged marriage is not bad; but for a full-grown adult like me, for an able-bodied youth like me, there cannot be and there should not be any other kind of marriage than love marriage.

And why, gentlemen, do I prefer love marriage to arranged marriage? Because if there be any disagreement between myself and my partner after marriage, I shall have the satisfaction that it was I who had made the choice, and, therefore, nobody should be blamed: otherwise I would be always cursing my parents or guardians whoever might have tied this milestone round my neck! Why should I curse my guardians or parents and earn a curse for my life in the life after death?

I would prefer love marriage to arranged marriage because by such marriage I would be able to know beforehand my partner's temperament, her habits, her thoughts and views on things, so that I could judge beforehand how far she would be agreeable to me, how far I would be acceptable to her because she too would have similar opportunities for studying my character, my flaws, my temperament, my defects etc. This kind of mutual study before actual marriage is absolutely necessary these days because now-a-days everybody wants to accept or reject things with an open mind or with open eyes, so that there may not be any cause of sorrow or regret afterwards.

Would you not agree with me, gentlemen, that arranged marriage is in vogue only in backward, barbarous and uncivilized countries. But I am sure, our country is far more advanced than Africa or China atleast in culture, and we have also now-a-days developed the democratic spirit; and therefore, there can not be any arranged marriage among the Hindus. Then again, child marriage has long ago been abolished, and most of the marriages take place between the age of twenty and thirty when both man and woman are full-fledged not only in body but in mind also or atleast in the power of judging and selecting a life's partner.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I would always prefer arranged marriage

because cupid is blind, because full-grown men and women, when they meet together, grow absolutely blind, and, therefore, can not judge their mutual defects under the intoxication of the opposite sex-attraction. Why should I take for granted that my parents or guardians would make a wrong choice of marriage for me when they are my greatest well-wishers, when they are perfectly mature in brains and also sufficiently experienced in the matter of marital relations? My preceding speaker said that our guardians and parents look more to the profit side than to the sentimental side of marriage; but personally I believe that marriage should be viewed not from the sentimental point only but it should be considered from the material point of view as well because, after all, marriage is a social contract and not a spiritual union as we Hindus generally take it. If marriage were really a spiritual union, man or woman should not marry for the second or third time at all on some plea or other as we Hindus and our ancient forefathers have been doing. Marriage is definitely a social contract, and the contract should last as long as there is perfect agreement between the two partners; otherwise they should part and remarry as the Christians do. I personally appreciate more the conception of Christian or Muslim form of marriage. There is no question of sentiment about such marriage. We Hindus talk of sentiment, spiritualism and such other things but we never honour our own words because the Hindus have got in them both polygamy and polyandry both of which are against any spiritual conception of marriage.

I sincerely believe that arranged marriage is a much more clean marriage than love marriage which pre-suppose certain extra-marital relations before marriage, and which in my opinion is highly objectionable. Why should I have any sexual contact with my life's partner before our marriage? And why should I also accept such a partner for the first time in my life who has had sex-contacts with others before her marriage with me?

My preceding speaker is absolutely wrong when he says that child marriage has been abolished in our country. If you go to the rural areas you will find practically ninety per cent

of the villagers, inspite of the Sarda Act, get their children married at the age of ten or twelve or even earlier. I am not ashamed of child marriage at all because in child marriage, which is absolutely an arranged marriage, there is one great advantage, namely, that from childhood the two partners become attached to each other without knowing their defects or virtues, and as such, when they grow up further, their mutual attachment becomes stronger and stronger, and therefore, there is lesser probability of any future separation between the two. It is because of child marriage in our country that married life has been, generally speaking, quite happy, and very few of the partners except the perverted ones ever thought of divorce or separation after marriage.

Love marriage, in my eyes, is a meaningless word although millions and billions of people of the Western world as well as of the Eastern world talk about it. What is love marriage except marriage by opposite sex attraction? What is love except an infatuation through the eyes or rather through all the youthful limbs of the body? It is, in my opinion, a beastly form of marriage because just as among the animals and the birds there is such sentiment as love except a desire of the flesh, so also among human beings there is nothing else but that. Hence, why should we make a fun of ourselves by talking of love and love marriage?

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I can never subscribe to arranged marriage on any account. I will give you the following reasons against arranged marriage which you should seriously consider before you decide to vote for or against it :—

1. In our country when there was no provision for divorce many of our young women, who were forced to marry undesirable partners by their guardians or parents, committed suicide by either swallowing poison or by setting fire to their clothes or by jumping in the well or by doing some such act of self-destruction. If these young women were permitted to have their own choice in marriage, there would have been no such tragedy.

2. Indian guardians or parents are in the habit of demanding heavy dowry from the bride's party on behalf of the bridegroom, and this system of sale and barter I hate with all my hearts. Marriage should not be degraded into a commercial transaction, and when marriage is treated as such, it loses all its sanctity, all its charm, all its romance

3. When the parents or guardians of the bridegroom bargain with the bride's party for settling the dowry, they invariably have nothing in their view except money, and hence, they never consider desirability of the match from the angle of either the bridegroom or the bride ; and hence, the real aim or purpose or ideal of marriage suffers leading to married unhappiness between such ill-matched partners.

4. It is absolutely a wrong idea that if the bridegroom and the bride come in touch with each other from their childhood, they get adapted themselves mutually during their married life inspite of their great differences. Intimacy during childhood is no intimacy at all because before the maturity of the mind how can the bridegroom and bride judge or even analyse their mutual angularities, differences, defects and deficiencies ? Ofcourse, in a country like India where man has always played the dictator and woman has played the victim of dictatorship, she can not expect any fair deal from him after marriage in case there are radical differences between the two ; and therefore, it is the woman who suffers more due to arranged marriage either in childhood or in adult age because man has always had the liberty in our country to marry as many times as possible while woman has had no chance to remarry even after her widowhood in tender years.

5. Arranged marriage is obnoxious because it has no sentiment about it ; it does not feel like marriage at all ; it is just like forced mating between the cow and the bull for breeding purposes

6. Love marriage is true marriage because it is executed in maturer years when there can be some kind of reciprocity of feelings or sentiments between the marrying partners ; and it is this reciprocity which is the real foundation-stone of human

marriage ; otherwise there would be no difference human mating and animal mating.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am dead against love marriage because it is no marriage at all. The very expression "love marriage" is an outrage on the sanctity of human marital relations, because what the modern world calls love is nothing but lust or bodily infatuation. Ofcourse, marriage of any kind can not be segregated completely from such infatuation, and yet if human marriage means nothing but this kind of bodily infatuation, then let it take any form, any name and pass for marriage. You must be knowing, gentlemen, what is being committed in the name of love in the Western countries and also in some of the perverted Eastern countries. I do not think, there is anything like love atleast between man and woman in any kind of relationship although there is much of it between the mother and her children, which also, the modern psychologists like Dr. Freud and others say, is a kind of animal instinct or a bodily infatuation, and therefore, which is not love at all in the sublime sense in which we generally use the term.

I give you the following arguments against so-called love marriage :—

1. Love marriage presupposes some period of courtship before marriage, and it is something like honey moon after marriage, which means, in other words, that every kind of intimacy takes place between the two partners, not excluding sex contact ; and when once this sex contact is made, the whole thing sinks into the level of the beastly relationship which we call mating. In U.S.A., for the last few years, "dating" has been going on between boys and girls of ten and twelve, and all the guardians are getting alarmed at this strange craze of the youngsters for "mating" rather too prematurely.

2. Inspite of love marriage all over America and Europe divorce is going on side by side. What is then the significance of love marriage if six months or one year after marriage one of the partners sue for divorce ? This clearly proves that love marriage is no guarantee against divorce or legal separation.

Practically every morning in U.S.A. there are several cases of divorce which follow soon after their so-called love marriage, and yet I wonder how people pollute the words "love" and "marriage" on such a beastly plea.

3. Love marriage means nothing but pre-marital sex-intimacy which is never possible in arranged marriage, and that is why, love marriage is getting so popular all over the world.

4. People say that love marriage is a mark of freedom but I would like to say that it is nothing but a form of licence, and as such, it is the backdoor to all sorts of sex-indulgence prior to marriage.

5. Just consider the cases of those who after a period of hot courtship do not actually execute their marriage with the partners with whom they carry on their sex intimacy and sex-indulgence. Do you mean to say that such partners can ever find any real conjugal happiness with other partners with whom they are finally united in marriage after repeated courtships with various partners?

6. In our country for ages, arranged marriage has been in vogue, and yet there are very few cases of conjugal unhappiness reported to our ears, and why? Because our men and women do not have any pre-marriage sex-intimacy or sex-indulgence. It is this pre-marriage sex-intimacy which spoils the whole game and turns marriage into a cheap transaction. That is why, Bernard Shaw rightly remarked that marriage is nothing but legalised prostitution.

7. In arranged marriage, it is the guardians or the parents who consider the desirability of the marriage between two partners with their long experience and cool-headed judgment, and that is why, they are not likely to commit any error in making the choice of marriage. But in the case of love marriage, both the partners being full-blooded young men and women grow absolutely blind to each other and as such never care for each other's defects or flaws because of their bodily infatuation but when after marriage these deficiencies loom large before their eyes there is a rupture of the marital tie which is the whole tragedy of love marriage.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, whatever others have to say for or against love marriage I am always strongly in favour of it, and dead against arranged marriage. I do not deny any of the arguments put forward against love marriage, and yet I would always say that love marriage is real marriage while arranged marriage is no marriage at all. I give you the following further arguments in defence of love marriage over and above those arguments which have been put forward by other speakers on my side :—

1. Love marriage really means marriage with the full consciousness of sex-union which is not possible in the case of child marriage because child marriage or even adult marriage in certain cases is arranged by the guardians or parents.

2. In child marriage, the partners are generally of the age of ten or twelve or even younger in which case none of them attains their puberty or maturity, and hence, there cannot be any consciousness or enjoyment of sex-union which is the consummation of marriage.

3. Marriage has also another aspect of it ; I mean, the responsibility part of it, which the partners can not possibly realise if their marriage is arranged by their parents or guardians. The sense of responsibility dawns only after the fulfilment of sex-union ; and also when the partners themselves make the choice of their marriage

4. Love marriage was prevalent even at the primitive stage of the human race, and I do not seem to follow how arranged marriage came into existence by ousting love marriage. I think, it was the selfishness of man or rather his dictatorial tendency or even his honest suspicion that woman might go wrong if she remained unmarried till late years (*i.e.* till the attainment of puberty) inspite of her strong mother instinct, that led to the introduction of arranged marriage in place of love marriage.

5 All the fourteen kinds of marriages which were prevalent amongst the Hindus during very early ages were nothing but different forms of love marriage in the sense that first of all

came the sex-fulfilment and then came the formal execution of the marriage ceremony.

6. Sex-union before actual marriage is most desirable for various reasons, namely, that you can test your partner's sex-compatibility with you before actual marriage or the formal ceremony. Sex-incompatibility has been the cause of ruin of married happiness in innumerable cases. But what does it mean? It means how far the sex organs of the partners are equal in size, strength, potency, girth, length, etc. According to Vatsayana, the greatest sexologist of the East or rather of India, a woman of the *Hastini* type must not be married with a man of the rabbit species but she should be united with a partner who possesses the sex-organ as long, as stout and as vigorous as that of a horse, and it is only then that there can be full sex-fulfilment; otherwise how can a man with an insignificant sex-organ satisfy a woman with a deep and long vagina and also with an abnormal sexual desire. Women of the *Hastini* type when they get married with the men of the rabbit type are bound to become corrupt in their character or widows soon after their marriage. On the other hand, a man of the horse type or having his sex-organ as long, stout and vigorous as that of a horse must not be married to a woman of the *Sankhini* type or even of the *Padmini* type; he should better be married to a woman of the *Hastini* type in order to match their abnormal sex desire and also their unusual sex organs. Unless there is some medical examination of both the partners before actual marriage these tragedies of the incompatibility of sex can not be avoided; but if sex intimacy is taken for granted as it is done in the case of love marriage, such catastrophes can be avoided almost cent per cent. It is due to sex incompatibility that conjugal happiness is marred for ever unless there is provision for divorce and remarriage after divorce. Indian Hindu males were very cruel in the earlier centuries. They enjoyed the privilege of remarriage over and over again but they never granted the same privilege to their women; and that is why, probably most of the dissatisfied or discontented women, who had to remain unmarried even after they were discarded by their husbands, had to take recourse to private or public prostitution.

7. Then again, how did polyandry become popular ? I am sure, it was due either to the scarcity of women, or due to the sexual impotency of men. or due to the undue prevalence of the number of the *Hastini* women and rabbit males !

8. Human marriage means also some kind of exchange of views, thoughts and ideas without which, according to Van de Velde, one of the greatest German sexologists, there cannot be any ideal marriage. How can there be such an exchange in child marriage or in arranged adult marriage ?

9. In *Paisachik* or forcible marriage, in *gandharva* or voluntary marriage or marriage by mutual consent, there is some element of love marriage but in arranged marriage there is absolutely no such element, and hence, in my opinion, it can not be regarded as marriage at all.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	70	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	75	„ „ „ „		
Third Speaker	„	60	„ „ „ „		
Fourth Speaker	„	70	„ „ „ „		
Fifth Speaker	„	75	„ „ „ „		

REVIEW

All the speakers have done very well. It seems, most of speakers were well prepared. The views on both sides are cogent and convincing although some of the arguments put forward have become quite stale probably because the topic of discussion is pretty old. Nevertheless, the success achieved both for and against the proposition is quite remarkable.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has nothing to comment except to express its congratulations to all the speakers who have equally done

well. The Board wants to point, just by the way, that the days of arranged marriage are long over; but at the same time, there is a tendency against love marriage particularly among most progressive nations of the world, chiefly the Americans and the Europeans who took the lead over others in freedom of the sexes. The freedom of the sexes is another great problem of the modern world, which is chiefly due to the hard struggle for existence, and no less due to growing democratic spirit in social, domestic and political life. The question, therefore, arises—whither is man or woman bound?

Discussion No. 24

WHICH IS THE SECRET WEAPONS OF A SOLDIER— BRAIN OR ARMS OR SELF-CONFIDENCE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, I am strongly of opinion that brain plays the greatest part not only in soldiering but in all other vocations. Can you be a successful man as a lawyer, or as a tradesman or even as a technician if you have no brains ? People say that the teaching profession requires no brain ! But how can a teacher maintain discipline in the class-room if he has not intelligence enough to tackle a group of students ? How can he explain things to his pupils if he does not apply his brains to the task ? A soldier of today requires more of brains than of arms or physical strength. In former days, physical strength or physical courage was the greatest factor in deciding victories or defeats in the battle-field. But now-a-days, because of various kinds of new weapons of war and also because of military strategies, the soldier requires more of brain than of brawn (muscle or physical strength). Modern weapons of war require much of technical knowledge and skill and considerable intelligence in handling them. The modern soldier has to read a lot of literature, maps, strategies connected with warfare on land, under water and in the air before he can encounter the enemy. The modern soldier has, therefore, to undergo a lot of training before he actually marches into the battle-field where he will have no time to think, no opportunity to ponder ; and hence, he will have to plan everything beforehand; he has got to acquire perfect knowledge of the wireless, of

the various kinds of engines, of the different types of weapons, vehicles, signals, symbols and signs of communication—all of which require a good deal of brains or intelligence. The modern soldier has to study such difficult sciences as physics, chemistry, statics, dynamics, geography, oceanology, meteorology etc. without which he would be completely useless in the operation theatres. The modern art of fighting requires a lot of knowledge, tact, cleverness, thinking, alertness, a keen power of observation etc. The modern age is an age of science, and consequently, soldiering has become a regular science; it is no longer so much art it used to be formerly. If you are dull-headed, you are sure to be involved in great difficulties in the operation theatres whether you are an officer or a common soldier.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, if you have no arms. (which stand for physical strength or power) how can you fight with the enemy? These days, arms are the things that matter most. Most of the modern weapons of war require mechanical skill and not much of brains; otherwise how could the illiterate soldiers or the half-educated officers conduct wars and win victories too? The modern age is an age of machine, and everything requires some amount of mechanical skill. Do you mean to say that a pilot requires much of scholarship in physics or much of brains in taking off or landing an air craft, or a common soldier requires much of intelligence in handling a machine gun or an anti-aircraft gun or in driving a tank? Certainly not.

Even in modern warfares, a common soldier or even an officer has to be perfectly healthy and strong and also capable of enduring all kinds of hardship. He has got to be familiar with all kinds of modern weapons otherwise with all his brains or intelligence, he will fail in the actual encounter with the enemy. During the unprovoked aggression of China against India, was it intelligence or arms or self-confidence that pushed back the aggressors? In my honest opinion, it was not so much of intelligence as of physical courage and power of endurance and also of self-confidence or faith that secured the

Indian soldiers to secure an advantage over the Chinese soldiers although the Chinese soldiers greatly outnumbered the Indian soldiers. The Gurkhas and the Sikhs particularly are the strongest and most capable of all kinds of hardship in the battlefield, and it was mostly due to them that the Chinese were hurled back from their aggressive position.

A soldier has now-a days to work under all degrees of temperature, all levels of depths and heights, all kinds of the earth's surface—sometimes full of jungles and forests, sometimes ravines and gorges of mountains, sometimes river beds with shallow or deep water, sometimes in deepest snows as in Ladakh and in Kashmir or in other parts of the Himalayan border. He cannot sometimes get any cooked food or even any kind of food at all; his bones and blood may sometimes be frozen to death and he has to march forward in order to take up some vantage ground against the enemy otherwise he would be completely ruined. All these hardships require much of physical fitness and power of endurance. But physical fitness or power of endurance would be meaningless without arms. If a soldier does not possess sufficient quantity of arms and ammunitions he is doomed as it always happens in all battles whenever certain sections of the armed forces are cut off by the enemy in their arms supplies about which one has got to be very cautious, alert and watchful. A soldier has sometimes to march long distances carrying his heavy kit of arms, utensils, clothes and even food. So, unless a soldier is brawny how can he perform all these physical feats? War is not meant for women or for delicate and soft men. Soldiers must be all steel-framed in body as well as in mind because in their very face they have often to see many of their own comrades lying dead or blasted to pieces, and sometimes they have to tread over the dead bodies of their comrades attached to the same battalion or regiment or platoon.

In the battlefield, muscles and arms must go together because just as muscles alone cannot do anything, so also arms alone cannot achieve much. That is why, a soldier has to possess so many qualities and so many implements for carrying on operations successfully.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, let us, first of all, understand what self confidence or faith means in the case of a soldier. A soldier must have to be convinced of the rightness of his action, and at the same time, he must have sufficient confidence in his own powers to carry out that action. You know that nothing can be achieved in life without self-confidence. A student cannot get through his examination unless he is sure of getting through it. A pilot can not brave the unfavourable weather unless he is cock sure of tiding over it. A swimmer, a cyclist, a sprinter, a jockey can not reach the victory stand unless he has full confidence in his own capacity or about his own success even in the face of formidable competitors. Although Shakespeare has said security (too much of self-confidence) is mortal's chiefest enemy yet I must say that without sufficient self-confidence nobody can accomplish anything.

But what does self-confidence mean? Does it mean faith in one's powers? Or does it mean faith in the rightness of one's action? It means both; and therefore, both faith and self-confidence are absolutely necessary for winning a victory. If Indian soldiers had no self-confidence or faith in the rightness of their action they could not have repulsed or halted such a massive aggression from the Chinese, or they could not have beaten Pakistan hollow when she attacked Kashmir. I do not think that except a fool or an idiot anybody else would have too much of self-confidence or sense of security before he actually achieves anything—a victory or a success. Fools often over-estimate their own powers or capabilities and at the same time under-estimate the powers of their enemy, and that is why, they are always beaten in their game. But a soldier should not be a fool. He should have his eyes and ears—all open to the risks and hazards of war; he should calculate and plan everything before encountering the enemy; but at the same time, he should not lose confidence in his own powers or resources; if he does so (loses self-confidence), he will be vanquished inspite of his superior strength, superior brains, superior resources, and superior skill. That is why, I say that self-confidence is of paramount importance not only to a soldier but to every adventurer.

Fourth Speaker

But, gentlemen, a soldier without brains is just like a log of wood, and I am sure, he can achieve nothing. But does a soldier really possess any brains? People all over the world believe and say that all soldiers are blockheads, and if they were no so, how could they kill in cold blood? But that is no argument in my opinion, about the modern soldier's capacity for fighting or for winning a victory. You must be knowing that with the modernisation of warfare, the soldiers also have developed much of brains in action, much of tact and skill, much of imagination and forethought, much of the power of observation, much of technical knowledge in handling various weapons, much of alertness, watchfulness and readiness of mind, much of so many qualities of the brain which have become now-a-days indispensable in conducting and concluding a war successfully.

We should not forget that a commander is also a soldier although he rises from a common rank to the highest rank by dint of his intelligence. We have seen how Hitler, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung—all rose from a common soldier to the leadership of armed forces. If they were dunces or duds, could they rise to such eminence? Surely not. A soldier must possess organising capacity, power of control or discipline, foresight and insight, courage at an emergency; but on top of all, he must possess brains or intelligence without which all other qualities would go waste.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, some of the speakers have attached great importance to muscles or physical strength; others have prized intelligence above everything; while a few others have attached the greatest value to self confidence or faith. But I do not consider brain or brawn, faith or self-confidence so important for a soldier as his arms or weapons. What can a carpenter or a blacksmith or a ploughman or a weaver or a tailor or even a barber do without any of his implements? Nothing! Absolutely nothing! For a soldier, arms alone are the most essential things for defence as well as for offence. Let there be

numberless divisions of most highly trained, highly intelligent, bravest and skilful soldiers but if they are not provided with sufficient arms and ammunition, I mean, all sorts of weapons to fight with, they can be massacred like sheep and lambs by the enemy in a moment. When one atom bomb was thrown into Hiroshima and Nagasaki, more than one million people were completely wiped out, and why? Because the people were armless and altogether defenceless. If they had in their possession some missiles which could neutralise the atomic blast, all the people could remain untouched! Therein lies the magic of arms. Why is Russia or U.S.A. racing so hotly in the manufacture of all sorts of arms or weapons nuclear or non-nuclear? Because each of them fears that some new weapon may be used in the next war, and hence, each is trying to develop some newer weapon to neutralise even the newest weapons of the other. That is the real psychology at the back of the race in armaments!

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	55	out of 100 marks
Second Speaker	„	70	„ „ „ „
Third Speaker	„	60	„ „ „ „
Fourth Speaker	„	30	„ „ „ „
Fifth Speaker	„	30	„ „ „ „

REVIEW

Out of twelve candidates for interview, only five speakers have taken part in the discussion; and except two speakers all the rest have done badly. Only the second speaker and the third speaker have given good arguments in defence of their position, and they seem to know what a soldier should be like, while others have no idea of soldiering, and hence, they should better not choose to be soldiers.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board regrets that the whole show has been spoilt,

and it regrets all the more that those candidates who come for a commission in the Armed Forces have no idea of what a soldier should be or what his essential qualities are expected to be. This batch of candidates except one who has scored the highest should be disqualified for a commission in any of the Armed Forces. It is rather unfortunate, when India needs so many youths in her Defence Services, such a small number is often found to be fit for any kind of military service.

Discussion No. 25

SHOULD WE BE VEGETARIANS OR MEAT-EATERS

First Speaker

Gentlemen, Mahatma Gandhi, the greatest man of our country, was a strict vegetarian all his life. He was a vegetarian because he was born a Jain, and you must be knowing that all Jains are strict vegetarians because they have got a religious prejudice against meat-eating. The Jains often go to extremes in vegetarianism. Some of them go covered in their mouth lest some living creature should get into their stomach and thereby they would be committing the sin of eating the flesh of some insect or fly ! A few others allow the mosquitoes and the bugs to suck their blood because they believe that thereby they would be earning some virtue ! How can such people kill a lamb or a hen in order to eat their flesh ? But it is also strange that they eat vegetables without any guilty consciousness although some of the educated Jains must be knowing that vegetables have as much life as animals and birds.

Anyhow, those who are vegetarians always argue in favour of vegetarianism, and they are equally blind to all other arguments in favour of meat-eating. Gandhi too had his own arguments in defence of vegetarian diet and many more arguments against non-vegetarianism. When Gandhi went to England for the study of law, he suffered a good deal for several days due to his vegetarianism because in those early days, it was almost impossible find a single hotel or restaurant in England or anywhere in Europe that could serve vegetarian dishes. What Gandhi had to do was to live mostly on loaves

and milk and nothing else. Then he started cooking his own vegetarian meals, and that is how he kept himself alive so long he was in England.

But personally speaking, I am strongly in favour of non-vegetarianism *i.e.* meat-eating chiefly because I relish it and also because of the following reasons :—

1. Meat is high protein which gives heat and energy to the body and lends it the power of resistance against cold, hard work, various wasting diseases like tuberculosis etc.

2. The human body requires protein as much as fat and carbohydrates ; and hence, meat cannot be eliminated from our daily food without weakening our body or reducing our vitality, because it is meat which contains much of protein in it.

3. Our ancient forefathers used to live entirely on raw meat just as the beasts in the jungles do, and that is why, the primitive human beings were so strong and healthy.

4. Even now-a-days, the cannibals of Central Africa eat raw flesh and even human flesh ; and that why they are so strong and ferocious. The beasts like the lion and the tiger too live on raw flesh, and they are also equally strong and ferocious !

5. God or Nature has created all kinds of food for man, and, therefore, there should be no prejudice against meat-eating.

6. In colder countries, meat-eating is absolutely essential because otherwise it is difficult to preserve heat in the body, and you should know that heat is the source of life in all living bodies.

7. It is man, and not Nature, who has created his likes and dislikes in food and drink. Eating vegetables is an artificial taste which was acquired by primitive human beings when they had left living in jungles or in the company of beasts and animals.

8. Those who live on meat are generally much stronger

and also far more active than the vegetarians. Indians are comparatively much weaker than Europeans because of the Indians are vegetarians while all Europeans are meat-eaters !

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, in my opinion, there should be no prejudice against any food or drink in the world. One should take any kind of food whichever is suitable to his taste and health. There is a proverb in Urdu that one should eat according to one's own taste but one should dress according to the taste of others. I have been always following that proverb. I have been taking vegetarian diet ever since I was born, and I like such diet which is I find also suitable to my health. I do not know why I have got a great hatred for any kind of meat diet ; I feel nausea whenever I find anybody taking meat in my presence. I do not know why I feel that meat is an unnatural food for human beings. I have no religious prejudice against any kind of food, but then, I feel that whichever food human beings have been taking for generations or centuries is their natural food. In our country, our forefathers mostly used to live on vegetables probably because vegetable food is perfectly congenial to hot climate while meat diet is favourable to cold climate.

In most cases we find that those who live on meat diet in our country, as Muslims generally do, are more passionate, more short-tempered and irritable, more easily exhausted by hard work, and also easy victims to various kinds of skin diseases and also diseases of the intestines such as dysentery, typhoid fever etc. Hindus are mostly vegetarians, and possibly on that account they are far more cool headed, tolerant, patient, hard-working and even self-sacrificing than the Muslims who chiefly live on meat, particularly, beef which generates undue heat in the body and gives rise to all sorts of disturbances in the digestive system.

Then again, I can not stand the sight or the idea of killing any living animal in order to provide us with food. The very thought is shocking to me, as Mahatma Gandhi too used to feel shocked whenever people talked of killing goats and

lambs and offering them as sacrifices at the altar of some god or goddess. Ofcourse, I know that vegetables also have life in them, and hence, when we eat them we should be similarly shocked; but then, some how or other I have been used to the idea of killing vegetables and making food out of them; and that is why, I do not feel any revolting sensation or nausea when I eat cooked or raw vegetables

Our ancestors used primarily to live on vegetables, fruits, nuts and roots of trees when they had walked away from the jungles and were comparatively civilized. I do not know why I am inclined to believe that vegetable food is a more natural diet for human beings; otherwise why should majority of the human population take vegetable food instead of meat diet. I am not prepared to accept the view that meat is absolutely necessary for the preservation of the human body. Do you mean to say that millions of human beings who are taking vegetarian diet are not alive or healthy or strong. On the other hand, the *brahmacharis* who live strictly on the vegetarian diet possess the healthiest body and the strongest mind. Most of the saints of our country are vegetarians and not meat eaters. We are told that vegetarian diet ennobles the human mind spiritually, while non-vegetarian diet degrades the spirit as well as the moral sense of man and turns him ultimately into a licentious brute! Those who take meat regularly are sexually most passionate, and hence, they are given to licentiousness or debauchery.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I have listened to the arguments of both sides, and yet I feel convinced that the vegetarian diet is the best, the most convenient, the most easily procurable as well as digestible diet in the world. You can find vegetables, everywhere and at a much cheaper cost too. But in order to secure meat, you will have to kill a bird or an animal with your own hand or secure it from some butcher's stall which is not always available in the rural areas or even in some of the smaller towns which are known as *Tehsils* or subdivisional headquarters! There is no disease in vegetables, and hence, by eating them you are not likely to catch the infection of any disease as you are likely to

do sometimes if you eat meat which contains the germs of foul diseases. Particularly, in fowls you can, find the *bacillis* of many infectious diseases, which you will readily contract if you eat their flesh. Vegetables are easily cooked while meat takes a lot of time to boil ; and if you go to mix spices with it, it becomes all the more indigestible, and, therefore, more harmful to your health.

Gentlemen, if you consult the statistics, you will find that vegetarian people generally live a much longer and healthier life than the non-vegetarian people, the chief examples of which can be found among the Hindu widows who strictly follow the vegetarian diet. The Hindu widows generally live eighty or ninety years while Hindu males live not more than fifty or sixty years even though they may be following the vegetarian diet all their life. But those who live on non-vegetarian food live a much shorter life. The strictly non-vegetarian beasts such as the lion and the tiger do not live more than fifteen or twenty years while some of the vegetarian animals live comparatively a longer life.

The very fact that our Hindu *Shastras* (religious scriptures) have prescribed vegetarian food particularly for the Brahmins, who are the most brainy people, should prove that vegetarian food contributes health and power to the human brain, while the very fact that the same *Shastras* have prescribed non-vegetarian food for the Kshatriyas (the next superior caste to the Brahmins), who are entrusted with the task of defence of their country in the event of a war, should prove that non-vegetarian food lends fighting energy to the body much more than vegetarian food can possibly give.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, it strikes rather very odd in my eyes for an animal to live on another animal's flesh. Human beings are also animals, and hence, when some of them eat animal flesh, should it not appear as rather odd and strange ? All animals, whether carnivorous or gaminivorous, live on their mother's milk for some days after their birth, and yet some of them later on take to meat-eating while others

take to vegetarian food. Why is it so ? It is very difficult to explain the mystery but I shall hazard my own explanation. I think that those animals which are graminivorous are much near to human beings than the carnivorous animals, in the sense that man has sprung up from the graminivorous species and not from the carnivorous species. The monkey is the best example, which according to Darwin is the immediate ancestor of the human species. It is a fact that the monkey resembles man more closely than any other animal. Besides, the monkey is the most intelligent animal next to man. There is practically no difference between a monkey and a man in physical appearance, in behaviour and also in many of the mental faculties. The monkey like man can express better than any other animal his feelings of joy, sorrow, anger and fear. The monkey is given a very prominent place in the greatest Hindu epic—the *Ramayan*—in which the monkey figures as the most faithful and powerful ally of Rama in his war against Ravana. It is doubtful if without the help of Hanuman, the monarch of the monkeys, Rama could ever defeat Ravana in the battle or destroy him.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am afraid, my immediately preceding speaker has talked much beside the point while defending the vegetarian diet and most of his comparisons are far-fetched and wrong. It may be a fact that there is much of close resemblance between the monkey and man ; and it may be also a fact that the monkey lives on vegetables—fruits leaves, nuts and roots of trees—but that is no argument why man should also follow the monkey's example in diet. My honourable friend says that man is much nearer to the graminivorous animals than to the carnivorous animals. Does he mean to say that our immediate forefathers were eaters of grass ! Well, I am not prepared to eat grass on that account, I would always vote for meat-eating. Meat is nothing but concentrated vitamin. Even a basketful of grass or any other vegetables does not contain so much vitamin as a handful of animal flesh contains ! Vitamin is the thing which alone matters in contributing vitality, strength and energy to the body,

while any kind of non-vitaminous food becomes when consumed by the body becomes its refuse! So, what is the fun of eating vegetables at all? It is for this reason that the soldiers are given meat diet so that they can keep up their bodily heat, their vital energy, their fighting capacity at any altitude and in any temperature. So, those who talk in favour of the vegetarian diet are themselves graminivorous animals, and I am not prepared to rank with them. I would, on the other hand, prefer to rank with the tiger and the lion who are the ruling beasts in the jungles?

Sixth Speaker

But, gentlemen, meat-eating spoils the brains, makes the blood hot turns a human being into a ferocious beast. All the meat-eaters in the world and particularly those, who live in hot countries, are rash, reckless, predatory, aggressive, vindictive, malicious, ill tempered, etc all of which qualities are disqualifications in man who is supposed to be cool-headed, temperate, patient, tolerant, national, sympathetic and considerate. A meat-eater may have the dash in the beginning but he soon loses his power of aggression *i.e.* he has no sustaining capacity, and that is why, he cannot offer any prolonged resistance to any striking power. The meat-eaters can never be good mathematicians or scientists or even good philosophers because both science and philosophy require much of cool-headedness and patience which a meat-eater lacks but which a vegetarian possesses; and that is why, you will find all the best brains of the world in the vegetarians, and not among the non-vegetarians!

Just try to mark closely the meat-eaters in the hot countries and what do you find them? They are all hot-headed creatures verging almost on insanity. It is a fact that very few of the vegetarians go off their brains, and it is also a fact that most of meat-eaters suffer from the most loathsome disease *i.e.* leprosy—the very touch of which is highly contagious as well as infectious. There are many other skin diseases from which the meat-eaters generally suffer. The physicians certify that meat-eating leads the human flesh (human body) to decay more easily than any vegetable diet. That is why, it is found

that the dead bodies of the meat-eaters are more easily decomposed than those of the vegetarians just as the vegetarians live a much longer life than non-vegetarians.

Seventh Speaker

Gentlemen, we have all come here for a commission in the Armed Forces, and we will have to defend our motherland against the aggressions of China and Pakistan. How can you fight with the meat-eaters by living on grass only? (laughter) We are told that the Pakistanis eat beef while the Chinese eat only rats! (laughter). If we can eat the flesh of horses and mules or of tigers and lions we can surely beat them! (laughter). But we Hindus are very funny. We consider everything—even food and cloth—from the religious point of view as if religion lies only in that. The Muslims too consider at least one item of their diet *i.e.* meat from the religious point of view. The Holy *Quran* has forbidden the eating of pork (hog's or pig's flesh) but why I do not know, Indian Muslims like the Indian Hindus follow their religion very strictly in the matter of their diet; and if any body happens to violate the religious injunctions he at once becomes an outcast of his community. You have noticed what a great agitation was launched recently by the Hindus against cow-slaughter. I shall not be surprised if the Muslims some day launch a similar agitation against pork-eating! Therefore, I would like to keep aloof from any kind of meat-eating. If I take beef, I will be a dead enemy to the Hindus, while if I take pork I will be a sworn enemy to the Muslims. Therefore, the safest course is to live on vegetables, and particularly grass! (laughter).

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	70	out	of	100	marks
Second Speaker	"	70	"	"	"	"
Third Speaker	"	65	"	"	"	"
Fourth Speaker	"	45	"	"	"	"
Fifth Speaker	"	40	"	"	"	"
Sixth Speaker	"	40	"	"	"	"
Seventh Speaker	"	30	"	"	"	"

REVIEW

Only three speakers seem to have done well, while the rest have done badly, probably because most of the speakers were not serious at all about the proposition itself or because now-a-days nobody makes a fad of his diet because everybody knows that whichever food is nourishing, invigorating and healthy for the human body should be taken, and also because most people have come to know that religion has nothing to do with one's diet.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board cannot be biased by any other view than the scientific view about diet ; and therefore, the Board believes that both vegetables and meat are essential for the preservation of life, energy and vitality in the human body as well as for the development of the human brains. The Board, therefore, regrets to notice that none of the speakers has pointed out the scientific aspect of food but on the contrary, the speakers have discussed the religious, the sentimental and other aspects of food. The topic has become too stale to be discussed in that manner, and science also has advanced quite a good deal in food researches. Consequently, the discussion of the topic on diet has been rather dull and hackneyed

Discussion No. 26

IS SCIENCE AT WAR WITH RELIGION ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, let us, first of all, try to understand what religion means. Religion, as I understand it, means a system of faith and worship ; it is a human recognition of superhuman controlling power and especially of a personal God entitled to obedience. But religion, as it is understood by the common people, means nothing but a bundle of dogmas or formularies laid down by any sect or church or community. Very few of the religions are free from such dogmas or formularies or rituals or ceremonies which have been observed by man from generation to generation ever since man started thinking of the mysteries of the universe and its Maker.

The next question which we should try to understand is what connection science has got with religion or how religion can be affected by science. This is a simple question. Man's conception of the universe and its Maker is definitely affected by man's knowledge of some of the mysteries of the universe, and consequently, the system of faith and worship which man follows at a particular stage of human history is also bound to be changed by his knowledge of the mysteries of the universe and its Maker.

Now, gentlemen, may I put you a straight question ? Has not your conception of the universe and its Maker suffered a considerable change with the advance of science which is nothing but a systematic knowledge of whatever we see, feel

and perceive all around us ? Formerly, we used to believe that the universe is just like an egg parted into two—the upper world being the sky while the lower world is the various heavenly bodies. We used to believe further that the earth is the centre of the universe, that man is the image of God (the Creator)—God the Son, God the Father, and God the Holy Ghost ! We used to believe, and even now millions of people, who have not studied astronomy, believe that heaven lies at the highest altitude of the sky while hell lies at the lowest level of space, and that heaven is all bright and glorious while hell is all gloomy and dark ! We used to believe in many more things, namely that every heavenly body is presided over by a deity (a god or a goddess), that there are angels who live in heaven, while there are devils who live in hell. Further we used to believe, and even now millions of people, who are ignorant of science, believe that man passes through various worlds (*i. e.* heavenly bodies) as he is born and reborn again and again after his death in accordance with the sins or crimes he commits in one life or the other. The ancient Greeks, Romans and the Hindus had their largest pantheon of gods and goddesses, angels and devils, cherubs and monsters and all sorts of fanciful creatures which can be built up by human imagination.

But now that we have progressed much in our scientific knowledge, do you think, we are still believers in those things in which we used to believe, five hundred years ago, when science was unknown to man ? Certainly not. Our conception of the universe has radically changed with the advance of our scientific knowledge, and some of us have gone to the length of disbelieving in God and in all human religions. This is how science has very seriously affected religion.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, we are forgetting altogether that religion has no connection with science. Science is a systematised knowledge of any branch of study. It does not dabble in religion or in any kind of faith which is not connected with matter or the physical aspect of the universe. Science never interferes with human sentiments or emotions, and as such, it can not have any reaction upon religion. Religion deals with the human

spirit and the spirit of the universe, while science deals with matter and whatever is concrete and perceptible through the sense organs. I do not think that religion is based upon any such sensual perception while science has nothing to do with what is supra sensual or supra-mental or supra-spiritual. Therefore, how can science be at war with religion or religion be at war with science? All that we can say is that the domain of science is quite different from that of religion, and hence, there is no question of any clash or harmony between the two.

Many people have been accusing science on the ground that it has made people irreligious or atheistic. But how? I do not understand what science has to do with God. If I want to believe in man as the image of God or even in an idol as the representation of God, you need not quarrel with me. And if you want to believe that God is a formless and abstract thing, I have no right to quarrel with you. I think, every body has got his own conception of God, and I am sure, he can never be disturbed in that. But if you go to say that universe is just like an egg-shell, or that the earth is the centre of the universe, or that man passes through various worlds by his birth and rebirth after death, science would surely quarrel with you and tell you in your very face that your conception is not corroborated by the facts which have been discovered so far by science.

Some people bring the question of morality into the domain of religion. This is again another controversial problem. I do not, in the first instance, understand what morality is, and in the second instance how morality is connected with religion. Does religion govern our conduct or behaviour too? In my honest opinion, there is no morality or immorality in nature, and accordingly, there is no such thing as morality or immorality in science either. Science would never tell you that you should speak the truth or must not tell a lie. All that science would tell you is that you should keep your eyes and ears and all your senses open so that your observation may be correct. Does falsehood or truth come under such observation? Certainly not; and therefore morality is beyond the domain of science, and it is also beyond the domain of religion. It is only man's

mind which has introduced the question of morality and immorality into religion ; otherwise religion has no connection with morality. A robber's morality lies in robbing and killing ; a swindler's morality lies in cheating and deceiving ; and hence, in my opinion, morality is absolutely a conventional affair. Science has nothing to do with conventions. Religion actually lives on conventions. The very conception of God, the very form of worship varies from country to country, from individual to individual, and from time to time ; but scientific truths and discoveries never vary or change like that ; and that is why, it would be wrong for any body to say that science is at war with religion.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, it is true that science has made tremendous progress in the present century but it has at the same time damped the religious spirit in man. Whether out of fear complex or out of sheer helplessness in a mysterious world, man has been believing in God as the creator of the universe, as the preserver, saviour or destroyer of all things in the universe. But science has told us that there is no such being as God or atleast we have not discovered him as yet ; and hence, it is foolish to invoke God in distress or to express gratefulness to him in happiness.

The development of trade and industries which is the concomitant development of science is another important factor which has made man forget his religion and God because it has made him more attached to wealth and power both of which have now become God and religion to man. The materialistic tendency of the modern world is the chief cause of man's diversion from religion and God, and if you believe that science is at the root of this materialistic tendency, you should be perfectly justified in saying that science is at war with religion ; otherwise science has very little direct connection with religion. The only link between the two is that science has dispelled the fear complex from the mind of man, and has made him at the same time conscious or confident of his own powers, namely, that he is also something of a creator because he has actually created many things with the help of science. From the railway engine to the sputnik, from the telephone and the telegraph to

the wireless, from the steam power to the atomic energy—science has discovered all and has thereby made man a demi-god in his own eyes atleast although in the matter of birth and death, man is as much a puppet in the hands of some unknown Power (God?) even now as he was before the advent of Science. And besides, the mysteries of the universe are so vast and inscrutable that even the greatest scientist feels himself completely at bay while pondering over the limitless space and the countless heavenly bodies. Therefore, in the eyes of an honest man who has not been much influenced by the discoveries or inventions of science God still remains the same old enigma or rather the same old sheet-anchor as He was before in the very dawn of the human race.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am still of opinion that science has nothing to do with religion, and hence, there is no question of any war or peace between the two. Some people argue that science stands for the body while religion stands for the soul. They say that science takes care of the body while religion takes care of the soul. They further say that there is an intimate relation between the body and the soul, and as such there is a great relation between science and religion. But how? That is what we are going to find out. The Hindu Vedantists and the Greek or Roman idealists like Sankaracharya, Plato, Socrates etc. believe that this universe is a mere *maya* or illusion, and as such, it has no reality. Then, what is reality? They say that it is the Ego and that Ego is God himself who thinks, feels and wills and who sometimes loves to create an illusion or a hallucination in order to amuse or entertain himself. This entertainment is known in Hindu philosophy as *Leela* or *tamasha* in which God or the Ego loves to indulge himself! Man being a creature of his senses is continually deceived by this *maya* or illusion or *leela* or *tamasha*. Science being dependent entirely upon the testimony of the senses is always moving in darkness, according to the Vedantist who is an ultra-idealistic philosopher, declares all scientific knowledge as *avidya* or false knowledge. Hence, in the eyes of religion, science is merely a *limbo* of darkness in which all of us are moving like the squirrel moving round and round in its cage

finding no outlet or escape from darkness ! So, if science is at all at war with religion, it is at this point only.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, can we say that there is no question of any war between science and religion ; or rather that there is perfect harmony between the two ? But wherein lies the harmony ? Science never interferes with anybody's personal faith or worship. You can believe in any fanciful thing, and yet science is not going to question it unless and until you try to force science to accept your imaginary view or conception. You may believe in God or not ; you may even believe always in the devil as some people believe only in the evil and not in the good of this universe ; science is not going to disturb you any way ; but if you go to tell science that God is like a bird or a snake or a beast or a human being, science will merely laugh at you and dismiss you as a dreamer or of an imaginative mind. Science never tells you that you should be dishonest in your dealings, that you do injuries to others, that you deceive and cheat and rob others ; or even that you should always speak the truth, do good to others, worship God day and night ; and hence, how does science come into clash with religion ? Science follows the policy of neutrality or non-alignment, and believes that religion can co-exist with it ; and that is why, in spite of all the developments of science man has not ceased to believe in God, man has not stopped worshipping Him in so many thousand forms—the Hindus worshipping idols of various gods and goddesses, the Christians believing in angels and devils, the Muslims believing probably in some supernatural beings, the Egyptians worshipping serpents and other reptiles, and so on. I believe, no body has the right to say that the Egyptians are right or the European Christians are wrong or the Hindus are superstitious or the Muslims are rational. Science would never pass any judgment over such things ; the only thing that science would say is that its domain is quite different from that of religion, and therefore, they have no agreement or disagreement between them.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, I equally believe that religion also has no

quarrel with science. Religion is a question of faith. Every individual has his own faith. Do you not see how different human individuals have given different names to the Creator of the universe—God, Jehova, Allah, Bhagwan, Parameshwar etc. A religious person may be either a great scientist or a philosopher or he may be completely ignorant of science and philosophy; but that does not mean that he has no conception of God or that he has no faith in God or that he does not invoke the Creator of this universe in distress or in happiness. Religion always says, “Follow the light within you”, whether that light is the source of real enlightenment or of complete darkness, or if that light is just like the will-o-the-wisp, Jack-o-lantern, *ignis fatuus*—as elusive as any of the three. No body, therefore, has till today been able to describe God; every body says that God is the source of life, light, knowledge, virtue, darkness, evil, good, preservation, destruction and all the opposite qualities that the human mind can think, or that God is absolutely formless, shapeless, sightless, odourless, tasteless, and minus-everything as he is at the same time plus-everything. Religion owes no grudge against any body except the immoral and the impious just as science owes no grudge against anybody except the ignorant and the blind. It is my sincerest hope that when man has advanced further in knowledge and piety, both science and religion will be one just as man and God will be united and merge into each other.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	70	out	of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	75	„	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	60	„	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	55	„	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	70	„	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	50	„	„	„	„

REVIEW

All the speakers have done admirably well, and those who have secured lesser marks have also done not badly because

every speaker's arguments are original and sufficiently convincing. It is rather striking and also very encouraging that most of the speakers are well-grounded on the topic of discussion. Not a single speaker has talked any thing irrelevant, and that is the best part of the whole show.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board notices with surprise and pleasure how such a difficult and abstract topic has been tackled so successfully by most of the speakers. It seems, Indian youths are philosophic unlike the western youths ; and therefore, the Board believes that the Indian heritage of culture has gone very deep into the very blood of the population, which is indeed a very promising sign of the highly developed national mind.

Discussion No-27

SHOULD WE KEEP ON ENGLISH AS AN ASSOCIATE LANGUAGE IN INDIA OR NOT ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, you must be knowing that when there was much of agitation in South India against the Hindi language as the national language of India and in favour of the English language which the South Indians refused to abolish and wanted to retain it as the medium of instruction in the educational institutions and also as the medium of communication between the States and the Centre, Nehru very wisely suggested and also got it promulgated that English would be retained as an associate language (companion language) along-side Hindi as long as the non-Hindi-speaking States did not pick up Hindi properly. But what is the position of an associate language ? Does it occupy secondary or an inferior place to that of the national language ? No, an associate language would have neither a superior or an inferior place but just an equal place with the national language in the matter of importance as well as of facility. What Nehru meant by English being an associate language was that English would be used the medium of official communication between the States and the Centre, that English would be treated as a link language *i. e.* something like a common medium of expression just like a *lingua franca*, and also that English would be cultivated as vigorously as Hindi in all educational institutions.

Nehru had a great foresight unlike most of the Indians. He knew that India had yet to be developed scientifically and industrially, and hence, English had to be retained as the medium of science, trade and industries. He knew that English

is most widely spoken and understood all over the world i.e. more than three hundred people understand English and also speak and write English for various purposes. He knew further that Hindi has no international status, not even an all-India status because Hindi is not spoken or understood or used in South India ; besides, Hindi is far less undeveloped than Bengali, Urdu, Telegu, Malayalam and Gujrati ; and therefore, Nehru correctly foresaw the danger of abolishing English from India all of a sudden. Last of all, Nehru considered the most important aspect of the English language, namely, that English is the richest language in the world, that it is the best and most perfect means of expression, that all the gateways of light and culture are open to the English language and not to any other world language so much. I also thoroughly agree with Nehru in this particular point, namely, that India would become culturally blind, scientifically lame, and industrially poor if English is banished from India although many of you would probably say that hardly 1.4 per cent of the Indian population knows English.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I am not at all in favour of retaining English as an associate or link language because by doing so we would be giving too long a rope to the English language and at the same time we would be undermining the progress or development of the Hindi language. When Hindi has been declared and also accepted as the national language of India, why should we not devote all our time, energy and money to its development, why should we fritter away our precious time, energy and money in pursuing English which has been misguiding our national culture and degrading our ideals for the past two centuries ? Have you ever heard of any independent country in the world that gives so much of importance to a foreign language as we are giving ? Is it not highly unpatriotic and anti-national to encourage the English language any further in our country ?

Honestly speaking, I do not appreciate Nehru's policy in retaining English as an associate language. Do you know, sirs, retaining a foreign language side by side with the national language of our country we shall be giving undue importance

to the foreign language, ~~and thereby we shall be retarding whatever little progress the national language would be or was making.~~ Besides, English has developed an inferiority complex in us particularly because we had been under the rule of the English people for a pretty long time and also because our masters never allowed any of our native languages to grow up or develop in any manner. We have been always told by our English masters that the English language is the best language in the world, that English culture is the highest culture in the world and that English character is the noblest character in the world. All these wrong notions have been injected into our head, and they have gone into our very blood with the result that we have developed a deep-rooted slave-mentality and also a chronic inferiority complex. Now if English is further pursued in our country, we shall forever remain as slaves although we are now politically independent.

Why should we think that Hindi is a poor language? It may be yet to be developed; but why should we believe that it is not capable of any further development? Was English highly developed in the beginning? Although Hindi has no international status at present yet how do you know that in the near or distant future, it will not occupy the same position in the world as English is occupying today? Rome was not built in a day. The English language took at least five hundreds years to attain her present stature. I would not mind if the English language is given a secondary place so long Hindi is not properly developed or does not become an All-India language; but English must not be given an equal position with Hindi, which is our national language. A national language in my view, is just like the national flag or like the national anthem, and it should be given the pride of place, and all other languages—native or foreign—should be placed at the pedestal.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I can not appreciate my immediately preceding speaker's prejudice against English or his fanaticism for Hindi. As an Indian I would sure love and honour our national language but as a student of world literature, world culture, world science and world philosophy, I would like to

cultivate the English language as best as I can without of course undermining or retarding the progress or development of any of the languages of my country. So long the English people were our masters, we used to view it as the King's English but now that we are politically independent we want to appreciate it as the language of world culture.

You can take up any of the branches of study, any of the departments of knowledge; you will find a rich mine of every one of them in English literature. All the sciences, all the arts have been thrown open to the world readers, the world students, the world investigators and researchers through the medium of English. You will not find books on so many subjects in any other language of the world. The reason is that English is the most highly developed and the most widely cultivated language in the world. How can a backward or underdeveloped country afford to neglect such a great language? We Indians are really stupid and blind; we do not like to gather pearls from the seashore of knowledge; we want to remain blind as we had been for centuries in the past. What has our prejudice against the English people to do with their language? A language should be cultivated on its own merits. Even Russia for the last three decades has been vigorously cultivating the English language inspite of their regards for her native languages. Russia is wise and clever. She studied science through the English language, and that is why, she is today in the fore front of all kinds of scientific, industrial and technological developments. India is such a backward country in every respect, and yet she wants to neglect the English language! There can not be any greater blunder or stupidity than this. We do not want to underrate or slight Hindi or any of our native languages; but we should be able to appreciate the values of the various world languages and try to get the utmost benefit out of them. When I look at the so called champions of the Hindi language, I feel ashamed that I am an Indian. You must have seen how these *Hindi-walas* feel proud of wearing the English dress, of speaking a few broken syllables of English, of aping the English ways of life without much of success. You must be knowing also how these *Hindi-walas* on the public platform champion the cause of Hindi by the beat of the drum, and how at the same time,

they send through the back-door their children to the Anglo-Indian Schools for their education ! It is because of these counterfeit champions of Hindi that the Hindi language has not become popular or has not developed in the least during the past twenty years ! Those who champion the cause of English are sincere and honest people, because they know the real value of the English language and also the dire need of our country for further cultivation atleast for another half a century.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I do not seem to follow why some of my friends are quarrelling over the language issue when they know that Hindi has got to be cultivated whether English remains in India or not. After all, there is no other language than Hindi which is so widely spoken or understood all over India. Mahatma Gandhi was wise that he made Hindi the national language of India. He knew the popularity of the language and also the possibilities of its development. He also knew that Hindi is most akin to many of the Indian languages e.g. Bengali, Gujrati, Maharati, Punjabi. It is only to the South Indian languages that it is not akin, and that is why, the South Indians wanted to have English as an associate language. But then, the South Indians are well-versed in Sanskrit from which Hindi is derived, and hence, it will not be difficult for the South-Indians to pick up Hindi sooner or later.

I have no prejudice against English or any of the foreign languages ; but then, a foreign language must not be allowed to strike any deep root in any country against any native language, because a foreign language invariably helps to denationalise a people which is the greatest calamity that can happen to a country. English has already denationalised us to a great extent. I should like to point out to you some of the marks of this denationalisation which has been wrought in our country during the last two centuries. Please note carefully the following points :—

1. We are putting on the English dress with vengeance even after our independence.
2. We take pride still in speaking English even at home.

3. Our children address as "dadies" and "mummies", and we take pride in such forms of address.

4. We are sending our children still to Anglo-Indian schools not because these institutions give better education but because the children learn how to speak in English.

5. We are still sending our boys and girls to England for their higher studies, not exactly for better education but for learning English manners and English way of life !

6. We still hate our native dress, native language, native culture and native everything !

7. We take pride in decorating our house in the English style, and we profess to have fondness for English dishes although I know, most of us do not relish such dishes !

8. We have contracted all the bad habits or rather vices of the English people such as smoking, drinking, gambling etc. but none of their virtues !

9. We inspect the troops, the guards of honour and salute our national flag in the English fashion.

10. We hold State banquets absolutely in the English fashion.

11. Even on the Republic Day and on the Independence Day we follow the same routine of ceremonies which the English people used to observe when they were our masters !

12. Many of us still take pride in carrying on our parliamentary debates in English although we can do it better in Hindi.

13. Most of the English-educated political leaders of our country take pride in giving address even to the common people in English although most of the common people do not understand English at all !

14. We observe the Christmas festival more enthusiastically than we observe the Hindu or the Muslim or the Sikh festivals.

15. We prefer English dance and music to Indian

dance and music. On the radio we switch on invariably to the continental stations or to such other stations which relay English music.

16. We observe our birthday anniversaries more by the birthday cake than by any of the Indian sweets.

17. Soon after our marriage we go out on our honey moon trips to some of the hill stations just as the English people do.

18. In cocktail parties we propose the toast and drink the health of the V.I Ps. in the English fashion.

19. Our women too have started aping the English costume—particularly the swimming costume and also the dancing gown.

20. We hung up English calendars and English portraits on the walls of our house.

21. Even in our club life we are following the English sports and games and all sorts of entertainments.

22. We prefer English pictures to Hindi pictures although most of the picture-goers are perfectly ignorant of English !

23. Even in our hair-cut and tailoring we follow the English or the American style but not our own Indian style.

24. We prefer going to the church rather than going to the temple or the mosque or the *Gurdwara* although we do not understand anything of the church sermons and the choir music.

25. Even in marriage we prefer the English style *i. e.*, marriage by registration in a court of law rather than marriage by any Hindi ceremony.

26. Most of us have forgotten the morning or the evening hymns which every Hindu chants in his prayers.

27. Most of us atleast put up a show of relishing ham and eggs, bacon and pork although in reality we do not like them at all.

28. In dancing in the clubs or in certain ceremonial

parties we exchange our partners with the wives and husbands of others although we are not liberal enough to part with them willingly.

29. We coach our domestic servants to address us and our wives as 'Saheb' and 'Mem Saheb'.

30. We prefer subscribing English journals, periodicals, magazines, newspapers although we do not understand English properly.

31. While meeting our friends or others we greet them in the English Style—'good morning'; "good evening"; and while parting we prefer the English forms—"Ta Ta"; 'Cheerio'; "Bye bye" etc ; as if we have forgotten our own forms of greeting.

32. Our women too prefer the English hair-cuts such as "bob"; "shingle"; they are more fond of the English lipstick, rouge, and other cosmetics.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, whatever others may have to speak in favour of Hindi, I am not in favour of it at all although I know that Hindi being our *Rashtra Bhasha* or the national language we cannot afford to neglect it. Honestly speaking, Hindi is probably the poorest language in our country ; it has been branded by certain scholars as the "bazar language"; it has no grammar, no vocabulary, no history, no sufficient literature even. In my opinion, Bengali is the richest and the most highly developed language of our country ; but then, because Bengali is not understood beyond Bengal, Mahatma Gandhi could not make it the national language although it deserved to be so (national language) more than any other native language. While thinking of the problem of instruction in schools and colleges, Gandhi in the beginning thought of Hindi as the medium of instruction because of its nearness to most of the native languages of India ; but afterwards he changed his view and said that the mother tongue of every child, every boy or girl, every youth should be used as the medium of instruction because it is only through the mother tongue that everybody can understand things better. Gandhi, therefore, last of all, recommended

that Hindi should be used as the official language while the mother tongue (any regional language) should be used as the medium of instruction in schools and colleges. But Gandhi was not anti-English. He used to say that English should be cultivated for the development of culture by which he probably meant the development of art, science and even trade and industries.

I would like to quote a few words of M. C. Chagla, our former Union Education Minister, who once said in connection with the medium of instruction pointing out the importance of English as such :—

“It would be contrary to history to deny that English did have a great unifying influence in our country. It was the language from which we learnt not only the principles of responsible government and democracy but the ringing words of freedom and human dignity which we used on many platforms to fight our British rulers. But a child must be taught in the early stages through his mother tongue, and therefore, in our primary schools we must have instruction being given through the regional language. The second proposition is that we must have an all-India language as a means of communication between States and as a language in which scholars and academicians can exchange their ideas and through which scientific research can be carried out. The Constitution has accepted Hindi as this language. It is not because Hindi is a richer language than Bengali or some other Indian language but because it happens to be spoken by the largest number of the people of our country. But Hindi is not spoken by or even known to millions of our people. Apart from our own regional languages, they are more familiar with English than with Hindi. The development of regional languages is going on apace, and I am glad that it is so. But in this development there is an underlying danger and a very serious danger that while we concentrate on this development, we may overlook the great national need for an all-India language which should act as a link and a bond to tie our people together. Let me first consider this problem in relation to our universities. We have fifty five universities today, and thirty five of them still retain English as the medium of instruction. Some have switched over to the regional languages and the others are contemplating doing

so. I appreciate the argument in favour of making the regional language the medium of instruction in the universities. If the regional language is confined, as the medium of instruction, to the elementary schools, then these languages will not have the development which those who speak them naturally desire. But English has been the medium of instruction of universities in some cases for a hundred years, in other cases, for although not so long a time, still for a considerable period. Today we do not have the necessary text books in the regional languages. The difficulty with regard to science is even greater. This is a scientific and technological age and the horizon of knowledge is expanding at an incredible pace. One can atleast translate text books in the humanities, but in sciences, apart from the text books, the student has to keep pace with new discoveries, and this he can only do if he is familiar with the large number of scientific journals which are at present only published in English or other European languages. Therefore, as far as science is concerned, even the translation of text books will not solve the problem. A large body of scientific scholars in regional languages must grow up, who will be publishing their researches in journals and magazines which will be available to the universities. This is a long and laborious process and must take a very long time. Therefore, a sudden change over from English to the regional language must result in precipitous lowering of standards more particularly in the field of science where, if we wish to industrialise our country and transform its economy, we need the work and co-operation of our best scientists and our best research scholars. But the change to regional languages must have another equally disastrous consequence. The history of India points to one lesson : that our country has fallen a victim to foreign invasion, has been subjected to a cruel partition, all because we lacked unity and national solidarity. Therefore, in the field of education, we must not do anything which will undermine our national structure and foundation of unity on which the edifice of our Constitution has been raised. What other consequence is possible if in the fifty five universities in this country graduates in arts and science are turned out who really know their own regional language and would not be able to communicate with graduates of other universities. Today we speak the same language even though it is a foreign language at a high-powered

conference held in Delhi. We do not want a day to come when we will need interpreters to interpret one Indian to another. It follows from this that we must have a common language at the university level. The constitution envisages that Hindi should be this language. But as I am not a politician, I can afford to be frank, and let us admit that this possibility cannot be contemplated in the near future. Therefore, English must continue, for some time to come, but we can not and should not prevent universities gradually adopting the regional languages as media of instruction, but while they are doing it, and I hope, they will be doing it slowly and carefully, they must constantly bear in mind the need for this common language, and the only way to do it is to make a study of Hindi compulsory through all stages of university education. But I would go further. We should also make the study of English equally compulsory because even when Hindi has become, in the true sense of the term, the official language of India, the usefulness of English will always remain. It constitutes a window through which we can look upon the world outside. It will be the window through which all the winds of new ideas, new thoughts can blow into our own country. It will always remain a language of international relations and a language of science. It is a great cultural asset we possess today, and it will be a shame and a tragedy if as a gesture to political Chauvinism we throw it away. But if we are going to retain English as a medium of instruction for some time to come and even afterwards to make it a compulsory language, it is necessary that English should be properly taught in schools from which the students will go to the universities. The most terrible thing that has happened in India today is that our standards in English have fallen everywhere, and in lowering these standards, we have overlooked the obvious fact that these poor students would not know sufficient English, will have to attend lectures in colleges where professors would be talking to them in English. How many professors have told me recently that when they deliver their lectures, they feel that they are addressing a dead audience. The students can not take in anything, and all that they can do is to study "cram books" in order to pass examinations. Therefore, let us call a halt to this foolish and futile vendetta against English".

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	60	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	65	„ „ „ „		
Third Speaker	„	65	„ „ „ „		
Fourth Speaker	„	75	„ „ „ „		
Fifth Speaker	„	70	„ „ „ „		

REVIEW

All the speakers have done almost equally well. Some of the speakers have offered very good arguments and also illustrations which further strengthen their arguments. One speaker has quoted a few words of some high educational authority. Such quotations should be avoided in discussions although the quotations may be quite apt and relevant. A discussion is a kind of a debate, and it should be conducted in one's own words as far as possible; ofcourse, incidental quotations of a line or two from well-known authorities are not objectionable.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

It is really gratifying to the Board that the discussion this time has been a good show possibly because of the preparedness of the speakers or because of their keen interest in the proposition. That most of the speakers are in favour of English goes without any question but an equal number seems to be in favour of Hindi as well; but the arguments of the latter are not so convincing as those of the former. The Board is in favour of both English and Hindi—English as the language of world culture, and Hindi as the national language of India. When once it has been decided and also incorporated into our Constitution that Hindi shall be the official language, it is no good arguing anything against it; but surely, the case of English as an associate language of India is a different problem altogether, and that is why, the present discussion has its due importance.

— — —

Discussion No. 28

WHICH PLAYS THE MORE IMPORTANT ROLE IN HUMAN LIFE—PLUCK OR LUCK?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, idlers and ignorant people are mostly believers in luck, while active and enlightened people believe in pluck (courage) only. I believe in nothing but pluck, and I will give you the following reasons for it:—

1. Man has been furnished with bodily limbs, with physical energy and also some amount of commonsense or intelligence with which every body should be able to do something.

2. Do the beasts and the birds and all other lower creations depend on luck? Definitely not. All of them believe in pluck, and that is why, they always exert themselves in order, first of all, to secure their food, and then, to preserve themselves against their enemy whoever or whichever they may be.

3. Similarly, it is the duty of man to exert himself as best as he can in order to exist in the world, and all human beings - big or small—do like that to maintain their day-to-day existence on earth.

4. It is only when one fails in doing something, he invariably attributes the failure to luck and not to the lack of his own pluck. Nobody attributes success to luck but everybody wants to claim it and attribute it to his pluck!

5. Man fails in accomplishing sometimes even ordinary tasks due to his own negligence, want of alertness, and may be sometimes due to some inherent defect *i.e.* lack of intelligence, foresight, prudence, promptness, and courage too. But then, natural deficiencies or proficiencies are not the gifts of luck, and hence, failure or success due to any of them should not be attributed to luck.

6. But cowardice or timidity, lack of industry, or want of punctuality and regularity or lack of alertness and watchfulness is not inherent in anybody's nature ; and hence, failure in any undertaking should not be attributed to luck.

7. All people have risen to greatness or eminence by dint of pluck, and not by luck.

8. Whatever is inscrutable to us we call luck, and whatever we can understand or explain we call pluck.

9. If you commit suicide, if you drive your car most recklessly and meet with an accident, if you take a leap from a three-storied building and break your neck or leg, if you deliberately jump into the fire only to be consumed to death, if you knowingly play with a cobra and if you are bitten to death, would you call it luck or pluck ?

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, the examples which my preceding speaker has given are irrelevant and futile. In my opinion, everything is due to luck because man is just like an atom moving in the midst of millions and billions of other atoms—human or material,—and hence, his very movement, his standing erect, his very preservation from destruction every moment—all are dependent not upon him but upon those millions and billions of human and material atoms. Man's knowledge of the universe is even now extremely limited ; he does not even know how he was born, why he came on earth, and he shall have to go away or what will happen to him after his death. When everything is lost in a mystery—a mystery which is unknowable, insoluble—how can man say that he is the architect or builder of his own career, how can he say that his illnesses, failures, poverty, disappointments, miseries, sufferings—all are his own

making? Does he know when he is going to die? He gets a heart stroke and he pops off all of a sudden. No doctor in the world can save him. Would he say that if he were careful, if some doctor were near, if some proper medicine were available at the psychological moment, he could never die? You are hale and hearty; you take off your plane into the sky after having tested the aircraft and found it perfectly fit. In the mid air, it suddenly catches fire or there is a breakdown of two of the engines, and then, you have a crash! Would you call it pluck or luck? Those who die normally, at a normal age, and of some common disease, after having suffered for a long time and also being attended by efficient doctors—would you attribute your death to luck or pluck? You are an aged man, you have got a fatal disease, say, coronary thrombosis, and yet you are surviving from day to day for years without any medical care—what would you call it—pluck or luck? And when a healthy youngman gets a sudden stroke of cerebral thrombosis or of cholera or he dies in a few minutes or hours inspite of all the best medical attention—would you attribute it to luck or pluck?

People say, man is the creator of his circumstances—the architect of his fortune, and yet a brilliant scholar, an industrious youngman rots all his life as a petty clerk in some government or private office, while another youngman of only mediocre caliber, all of a sudden gets into the Indian Administrative Service through backstairs' influence! How would you explain the difference in fortune? Would you call it pluck or luck? How would you explain the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, of John F. Kennedy or of Mahatma Gandhi? How would you justify the rise of Stalin from a mere stable boy or of Hitler from a signboard painter to the leadership of Russia or of Germany? How would you account for the Prime Ministership of Indira Gandhi? How would you again explain the phenomenal rise in fortune of Henry Ford from a poor mechanic to a multi-millionaire? How would you account for the winning of a Derby Sweep by a cobbler or a butcher? Do you mean to say, all these great events of human history are brought about by man's pluck? I, for myself, would refuse to believe in pluck. In my opinion, not a sparrow falls from heaven without luck! Everything in this universe is pre-ordained

but by whom I can not explain as none of you also can explain. It is indeed a great mystery how even the minutest things of this universe are controlled by some unseen Power which we call luck or destiny or *Kismet*. You must have seen it also in your own life as in the life of others that man is completely powerless against Fate or what we call luck. We boast of the human will—its freedom, its powers to accomplish things—big or small ; but in my opinion, we are completely powerless and absolutely at the mercy of luck !

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker seems to be obsessed by the idea of Fate or luck, and that is why, he attributes every thing to luck and nothing to pluck ! May I ask you a few plain questions ? Do you think, your food will cook itself if you do not cook it yourself or get it cooked by others ? Can you even get up from your bed or make any movement of your body if you do not exert yourself ? Can you expect to secure a job unless you try for it ? Will money come to your door if you do not work for it ? If you fall ill, and if you do not take sufficient care to remove your illness, can you expect to be fit again ? You may become fit again even without any care, but then, it is Nature herself that must help you unseen and uncalled for. So, it is not luck but Nature's pluck which restores you to health again after some illness ; but Nature will not help you always if you are irregular or intemperate in diet, if you are reckless in your habits of life—sleeping or waking ; and ultimately, your recklessness may cost your life too, which you would probably attribute to luck and not to the criminal neglect of your pluck !

I do not deny that man's powers are limited—his brains, his material resources, his environments etc. but then, certain persons in the world have been found to make up all these deficiencies by dint of labour, industry, perseverance, determination, courage etc. The lives of the great men and women all over the world are the best examples of pluck—how they rise from a small position to the dizzy heights of eminence ! No great man ever believes in luck. It is only the fools, the idlers, the ignorant people that believe in luck.

If in the case of the Chinese attack on India in 1962, we were prepared in our defences as we are now, could China ever dare attack us or could she inflict such losses on India ? Should we blame our luck in this connection ? Certainly not. Then again, in the case of Pakistani attack on Kashmir in 1965, how could we smash out Pakistan in such a manner ? It was simply because we learnt a great lesson from the Chinese attack, and naturally, we were ready with our defences. Can a Commander in the battle-field win any victory if he does not plan his attack or defences beforehand, if he does not mobilize his armed forces in time or if he does not collect sufficient arms and ammunitions for all of which he will have to exert himself to the best of his abilities and his resources, and it is only then, he can expect to win a victory over his enemy ; otherwise if he sits idle, makes no preparations, collects no arms and ammunition, secures no information about the positions or movements of his enemy, he is sure not only to be defeated but also to be destroyed. It is pluck that plays the most important role not only in big affairs but in small undertakings too. Even if a boy is exceedingly intelligent or brilliant in brains but if he does not work at all, how can he get through his examination ? Surely, luck can not help him.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, most people—great or small—believe in luck. Napoleon was the emperor of France ; Hitler was the dictator of Germany ; Stalin became the leader of the Soviet Union ; Mao Tse-tung fought the Civil War in China to a finish, and these famous personalities used to consult astrologers and palmists in order to know their fate. How would you reconcile their faith in Palmistry or Astrology with their industry, perseverance, determination, heroism, patience etc. which they had displayed throughout their life or career ? I should like to know who does not believe in fate when one is in great difficulties just as all people believe in God and invoke God's help in moments of crisis. I should like to know who at the time of his death does not confess that everybody is a mere puppet in the hands of fate ? It is only when one is in the hey-day of his youth that one does not believe in anything - not even in God because he believes that he is himself the maker or un-maker of things just as God is. But people who advance in

years, who have received knocks in life, who have suffered miserably in many spheres, who have not enjoyed much of success in their life or career, who have worked hard and yet achieved practically nothing, are bound to believe in luck or fate or kismet. But those who have suffered no rebuffs or disappointments or failures in life, those who have had a smooth sail in most of their life, those who have been unusually or uniformly successful in their career would refuse to believe in luck because they want to claim all the credit of their pluck in all their successful undertakings or enterprises. So, you see, gentlemen, how belief in luck or pluck varies with the changes of success and failure. Even a man like Shakespeare has said, "There is a tide in the affairs of men, and if you take hold of the spring tide, you are made in life, whereas if you miss the tide, you will simply ebb away in life (go on failing)." Of course, Shakespeare also was a human being like ourselves; and therefore, if most of us can believe in luck, why should not Shakespeare, Napoleon, Hitler, Stalin or others believe in it?

Fifth Speaker

But, gentlemen, whatever you may have to say in favour of luck, I am a staunch believer in pluck only and nothing else. Luck is an unknown thing: it is only an invention of the impotent mind. Many people complain that if there were no luck, how is it that most of the undeserving people without working hard, without possessing any qualification earn a lot of money and rise to a high position. My answer to such people is that those who appear to be undeserving are not actually undeserving; those who are found to be sitting idle are not idle at all because their methods or hours of work may be different; those who are found to rise to eminence all of a sudden through the back-door must have been working all their life to create personal influence which other people call back-door influence, underhand means. So, people who are found to be successful in their life due to so-called luck are successful due to their life-long labour or due to certain special quality or qualification which others do not possess; or it may be due to striking the iron while it is hot or taking time by the forelock which other people do not care to do. Do you mean to say, gentlemen, that all kinds of human progress—developments of science, trade, industries, technology, etc. are due to luck?

If you say, yes, I would say in reply that something is seriously wrong with your observation or judgment

It is a fact that Heaven helps those who help themselves, which means in other words that nothing can be achieved without pluck. Dick Wittington, Carnage, Henry Ford—all rose from poverty to opulence or from obscurity to fame—due to their pluck and not due to luck. If you say that lotteries are plays of luck, I would say that only one or two, and not all win the lottery; and hence, whether you believe in luck or pluck, you can not increase the number of the winners.

Then again, this universe is the effect of the law of cause and effect. There can be nothing without some cause; and hence, success or failure, both are due to some cause *i.e* some effort or tact or special qualification, and not due to luck or some fortuitous collocation of circumstances or what we call accident or chance. Clever people make the best out of the worst while stupid people make the worst out of the best, and this makes the difference between their achievements, which some of us attribute to luck. Some of my predecessors have said that God or Nature or Fate or Destiny has pre-ordained everything, and nothing, therefore, happens beyond that pre-destination. But how is it possible for God or any other power to have pre-ordained such millions and billions of living and non-living things? It is absolutely impossible. The greater events of life may be pre-ordained but the smaller incidents are too numerous or too insignificant to be pre-ordained. Do you mean to say that even your coughing sneezing, smiling, weeping, eating, drinking, dancing, singing etc all are pre-ordained? It would be pure nonsense if you think like that.

Some people say that the human will is free in a limited sense, and that is why, it is not possible for man to achieve everything. Well, in reply to this, I would like to say that everything is possible to be achieved. Ofcourse, you can not expect a child of five or ten to lift the same weight or perform the same task as can be done by a full-grown adult; it is not possible for common intelligence to invent the jet plane or the sputnik, the wireless or the anti-biotics; for great things, great intelligence and also Herculean labour is also required; and even then sometimes one may fail in achieving the end. Those

who are wrong observers, incorrect analysts, inefficient judges often confuse luck with pluck. There is actually no such thing as luck, however mysterious this universe may appear to be or howsoever limited human knowledge or powers may be. Three hundred years ago did man ever conceive of flying in the air without wings, send messages from one corner of the earth to any other corner of it without any messenger? But all such impossible, inconceivable things have been made practicable today. We are listening to New York music from Calcutta; we are flying from Tokyo to London in a few hours by the jet plane while by the space ship we can travel at a much greater speed *i.e.* fourteen or fifteen thousand miles per hour (we can travel by a jet plane at the speed of seven hundred to one thousand miles per hour). Formerly, diseases such as tuberculosis, typhoid fever, small pox, malaria, plague, cholera and others used to be considered as incurable but now-a-days how easy it is to prevent or cure them! And all this has been achieved by pluck and not by luck!

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	60	„ „ „ „		
Third Speaker	„	50	„ „ „ „		
Fourth Speaker	„	55	„ „ „ „		
Fifth Speaker	„	70	„ „ „ „		

REVIEW

All speakers have done tolerably well but one speaker has done admirably well. It seems the topic of discussion being too old and hackneyed did not inspire much of inspiration or enthusiasm in the speakers, or because the proposition itself is a dull or useless proposition. Nobody of the modern world believes in luck because it is such an inscrutable concept and also because everybody these days is living a very busy life and can not think of any thing but pluck.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board being the Services Selection Board does not believe at all in luck whatever may be the arguments advanced in its favour. So, the Board appreciates only the arguments advanced in favour of pluck. The Board, however, regrets that the present discussion has not been a very successful show although both the defensive and the offensive sides have tried to argue their respective positions as best as they could. The only thing which is lacking in all the arguments is that none of the speakers has been able to explain clearly what luck is or what pluck is.

Discussion No. 29

WOULD YOU PREFER HOSTEL LIFE OR HOME LIFE ? HOW WOULD YOU JUSTIFY YOUR PREFERENCE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, home is always sweet, and there is nothing sweeter than home. There can not be any comparison between home life and hostel life. Home life means the touch of parents, the touch of brothers and sisters, and above all, the touch of love which exists nowhere else in the world except in home life. In our country, particularly, home life is indeed the most enviable life. Our parents may be poor sometimes, we may have to live sometimes even in mud-houses or in thatched cottages particularly when we have to live in rural areas but that too feels like heaven to us when we live together with our little brothers and sisters, when we eat together whatever modest food we may have to take. Then there is also the touch of the village neighbours or friends who too are no less dear to our hearts than our own brothers and sisters. When in India there was the joint-family system, home life was much more enviable than now-a-days because now-a-days, due to various employments and also various kinds of education, the parents and sometimes the children too are scattered furthest away from home, and in that case, I do not know if home life would be dear to us. It is primarily the mother's loving care for the children which is the real source of attraction for home life. In a family, where the mother is missing or in her absence there be no elder sister to play the mother, nobody feels happy at home; and to crown the unhappiness if there be no little brothers and sisters, and particularly no sisters, home life feels a desert.

Then again, there are certain privileges and also comforts which one can find at home and nowhere else. I do not mean to say that every body can have a princely home just as the millionaires or the multi-millionaires can have; but I mean that however poor the family may be, even a bed of straws, a piece of loin cloth, a few *chapatis*, and just one dish of vegetables or *dal* (pulse) would taste immortal and much better than all the dainty dishes of meat, fish and eggs. It is all because of the sweet care of the mother who cooks food with her own hands and sometimes feeds the little children with the same hands. When a child is ill how anxiously and tenderly the mother attends the sick-bed which no professional nurse can possibly do. Then again, the little liberties which one can enjoy at home can nowhere else be enjoyed. These privileges are the liberties of eating and sleeping, playing or reading, chatting with the little brothers and sisters or even with the school or college friends whoever may be visiting us at home, and then, sometimes the occasional talk with the father although such talks are mostly in the form of advice how to study, how to be a good student, how to make the best use of time, how to get through the university examination, and how, above all, to build up one's character etc most of which may have practically the same effect as the priestly sermons from the pulpit in a church generally have upon the congregation. Nothing is really so sweet on earth as home!

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker has given a very romantic picture of home life which is not at all true. Indian home life is a kind of imprisonment. The Indian father is a regular dictator. The Indian mother is probably the only attraction at home; otherwise the brothers and the sisters are a regular nuisance. When the little brothers and sisters begin to quarrel and they often quarrel, home becomes a regular hell with their cries and howls. And if there be any elder brother at home, he plays the second dictator next to the father, and so, you are pitch-forked between the devil and the deep sea! The father and the elder brother will make your life miserable by ordering you constantly to do all sorts of odd jobs in which you are least interested; and unless the mother takes pity on

you and interferes on your behalf, you can have no escape from the devil or the deep sea !

Poor mother—she has got to work like a kitchen-maid, a maid-servant, a washerwoman and everything else, and naturally, if you love your mother which you can not but do, you will have to sacrifice all your precious time for studies and recreations for the sake of your mother. Ofcourse, if there be any elder sister at home, she would be indeed a great assistance to your mother and a great relief to yourself. If you are still young, you cannot possibly play the dictator to your younger brothers as your elder brother does to you. Any way, you do not feel happy at home at all inspite of the well-known English song—“Home, sweet home ; there is no place sweeter than home.”

If you are at home, you cannot enjoy any kind of liberty—the liberty of going out any time or meet your friends and talk to them, because you are constantly under the watch of your father or elder brother who reproaches you for wasting time, for not studying or for not doing any of the domestic duties although you may be doing a lot of work for your mother and others and also may be reading your books too. Then again, if your parents happen to be poor, and if they can not afford to engage any commodious house, you can never get a room to yourself entirely, and the result is that the bed-room, the sitting-room, the reading-room—all are mixed up and converted into a common room in which you have to read, lie down or chat with your little brothers and sisters who again make a hell of that one room with their cries, quarrels, laughter and all sorts of noise for which again your father or your elder brother scolds you for nothing because they would invariably think that you are the source or cause of all sorts of nuisance in the house ! That is how your life becomes miserable at home.

Then again, if your parents happen to be poor, as most of the Indian parents are really poor, you can not get any good food at all, you have got to share everything with your little brothers and sisters, and sometimes there is even a scramble for little things—some dainty dishes of food and drink—sweet or sour, which are rare luxuries in poor Indian homes—some-

thing like *chutney*, *Jelaibi*, some fruits like mango, guava, black berry, etc. As for your clothes, you will have to wash them with your own hands, and you may get almost one pair of *kurtas* and another pair of *pyjamas* throughout the year which you will have to put on at home as well as at school while some of your school fellows who put up in the school hostels wear various kinds of clothes and a good number of them which are regularly washed and ironed by the school *dhobi* (washerman) and which naturally look much more decent and smart than your poor crushed and dirty kurta and pyjama! You must feel awkward before some such school fellows who wear better clothes than you can ever afford to do.

In hostel life, there is no end of liberties, of freedom of every kind, and of many forms of recreation and pastime of which you can never dream at home. While staying at home, can you ever dream of going to the pictures, of going on excursions either into the interior of rural areas or to distant places in order to play matches or visit historical buildings or zoos or museums or other such interesting places? If you stay in school or college hostel, you are the sole master of your time and leisure; you can study at any time, sleep at any time, talk to friends for any length of time, and do whatever you like in the day or or in the night. Our Indian hostel-wardens or Superintendents of boarding-houses are very good people. They take the roll-call of attendance only once in the evening, and they never disturb you in your room at any other hour of the day or the night so that you are the complete master of yourself or as free as a bird in the air, and not like a solitary prisoner when you live at home! As regards the expenses for your hostel life, the money comes to you from your parents or guardians with clockward regularity and in that money you have also a portion of it as your pocket allowance which you can not get while staying at home because at home pocket allowance to every one of the children would mean a considerable amount which all parents or guardians can not afford to spare; and hence, in home life, you can not get any such allowance, and hence, you can not buy anything or eat anything extra or spend on any pastime or recreation whichever you may like. That is the real handicap of home life. Can you buy any ice-cream, any mango or orange, any of the

sweets from the bazar either to eat them yourself alone or share them a little with your school or college friends ? Certainly not. So, home life means a cut on your expenses, on your pocket money on your recreations, on your liberties, on whatever you would like to do or have. But in your hostel life you are the monarch of all you survey, you are the sole master of yourself with no father or elder brother as your overlord ! Who would not prefer hostel life to home life ?

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker has given you too rosy a picture of hostel life which unfortunately it is not. Have you ever visited any school or college hostel or boarding-house in the district towns ? It is so wretched ! You can never have one single room to yourself ; you are huddled together with three, four or even six boarders in one small room with no other furniture except probably *charpoy*s on which you have to sleep as well as to read. You can not get even electric lights in many of the school hostels. Sometimes the boarders have to lie down on beds of straw, and there is no *charpoy* anywhere in the hostel ! If you just talk of hostel food, you can not possibly regard it better than the fodder for cows and buffalos ! And why is it so ? Partly because the mess is left entirely to the hands of the cooks or of the hostel warden—all of whom enjoy the loaves and fishes for themselves while they offer the most rotten food to the boarders ! And the manner in which the hostel food is cooked brings only nausea when you go to take it ; but then, you get used to it day by day and make no complaint afterwards. That is how habit becomes second nature ! In home life, whatever food is available is cooked by your mother or sister or aunt, and as such, it is perfectly clean and pure ; there is no adulteration of any kind as you will find in hostel food because the hostel cooks mingle so many odd things with the vegetable or the *dals* (pulses) in order to make it alluring to the eye but most nauseating to the taste !

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker has said that in hostel life there is much of freedom or liberty which the children can not enjoy at home e.g. going to the pictures, sleeping and gossiping with friends for any length of time. That is very true but at whose expense all these privileges or liberties are enjoyed ? Surely, at the expense of the future career of the

boys themselves, because most of the boys who live in the hostels or boarding-houses do not study at all but waste their precious time either in sleeping or in gossiping. What can you expect from such idlers? Most of them fail in their examinations, and when they come home after several years without any academic qualification, they can not get any job anywhere because they are really worth nothing; they darken the whole future of the family; they further serve as bad examples to their younger brothers who also go the same way *i.e.* go to live in hostels or boarding-houses only to be ruined in the long run!

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, apart from any other consideration, home life is the best life for building up character under the strict supervision of parents or guardians. Very few of the children, who are bred and brought up at home, are found to go wrong in their life, chiefly because they do not get any chance of wasting their time, of contracting any of the bad habits from any of their undesirable companions, of developing any habit of extravagance, in temperance or recklessness. I should like to point out incidentally here that those who stay in the hostels or boarding-houses generally contract the evil habits of drinking tea, smoking cigarettes, of going to the pictures; some of them get into much worse habits than these; they learn many of the sex-perversions such as masturbation, sodomy etc.; some of them are initiated even to drinking, gambling and prostitution—all the three of which are the worst vices of human nature and one alone of which can ruin a man's career for ever!

There is no comparison between home life and hostel life; home life is heavenly while hostel life is hellish. If you happen to fall ill in a hostel no body will attend you in the sick-bed; nobody will care for you at all; you will find no doctor, no medicine, no invalid diet, nothing of the kind. In the hostel, all are summer friends *i.e.* no friends at all. The hostel warden will not care to have a peep into your room; none of the boarders with whom you passed so many days in close intimacy will ever care to come near you if you happen to suffer from any contagious disease such as pox or cholera or typhoid fever or dysentery. That is the sort of comradeship or friendship

you find in hostel life. But even if you have the slightest illness at home, your parents, brothers, sisters—all will care for you ; all will attend your sick-bed day and night by turns ; all will worry about you . all will pray to God for your speedy recovery ; and your mother, who is an angel at the sick-bed of any of her children, will watch you day and night, will give you medicine and diet with clock-work regularity . As far as the financial resources of your parents can afford, you will get the best medical aid when you are suffering seriously but in a hostel you will get nothing of the sort although your parents or guardians may be sending money to the hostel warden for your medical expenses and for your special invalid diet—fruits, milk and tonics etc. The money will be consumed by the doctor or by the warden, and the invalid diet of milk, fruits etc. will be consumed mostly by the hostel cooks and other servants ! Who would prefer living in a hostel if one can afford to stay with one's parents, brothers and sisters ? Parents and guardians, ofcourse, send their children to hostels with high expectations but all their expectations are shattered to pieces when the children have stayed in hostels for some years and come back home as incorrigible wrecks !

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I do not at all agree with any of the speakers who have exaggerated only the darker side of hostel life but not mentioned even one good aspect of it. Hostel life teaches so many good lessons which help to build up character and also the further career of our children . It teaches corporate life, comradeship, team spirit, self-help, courage, independence and so many other good things which stand us in good stead in our struggle for existence . When you stay at home under the protecting wings of your parents, you become delicate, dependent, and even selfish, timid and narrow-minded ; but in a hostel you have got to depend upon yourself, and sometimes you have to help others too ; you have got to come in touch with many human characters, because in a big hostel hundreds of students are boarders and some of them come from distant corners of your country or State, and that is how you can have the opportunity of studying the psychology and character of good many people. At home you come in touch with only

your parents, brothers and sisters whose character you all know quite well. Hostel life, therefore, adds to your knowledge of human psychology which is so essential now-a-days in dealing with all sorts of people in the offices, workshops, in society or public life, in trade and industries etc. Then again, at home you are under the apron string of your mother and under the protecting wings of your father, and naturally, you never feel like exerting yourself any way, and that is why, you grow practically unfit for any kind of hard struggle. At home, you can never learn the lessons of corporate life but it is only in a big hostel that you get some idea of it ; sometimes even in a small boarding-house where you have to be in charge of managing the kitchen, the food store and even the accounts of the mess expenses, you learn the lessons of independent thinking, independent judgment and independent decision in action, and that is how you become quite fit for the struggle for existence which you have to enter soon after the completion of your school or college or university career.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am afraid, whatever good things you learn at home you unlearn in the hostel because hostel life teaches you only certain bad things, initiates you to many of the bad habits or vices which you can never ordinarily contract under the strict guardianship of your parents. In the hostel there is practically no guardianship, no supervision of studies or health or character of the boarders, and that is the most risky part or aspect of hostel life. Young children or boys or even youths must not be left alone to themselves ; they require some guardianship who will keep a watch over their wards at a distance so that the wards may not go wrong, and at the same time, learn to stand on their own legs. Ofcourse, hostel life in England, particularly in the public schools is really ideal life which you can find nowhere else. That is why, most of the ambitious persons send their children at an early age to public school hostels ; but we have no such schools and no such hostels in our country. The public schools of our country were built up in imitation of the English public schools but we Indians have spoilt them, and that is why, in our public school hostels our children can not have the same good training as the

English children have it in their public school hostels of their own country. And as for other Indian school or college hostels, I personally believe, they are nothing but the training centres for bad habits, all sorts of vices of human nature, all sorts of bad manners and indiscipline which you cannot find even in the worst possible Indian home life. Hence, home life in our country is thousand times better than hostel life in most of the educational institutions of our country. In England, America or Europe, parents are comparatively selfish, and that is why, they send their children at an early age to school hostels whereas in our country the parents are so fond of their children that they do not want to part with them except on some urgent necessity *e.g.* when there is no good school in a village or no good college or university in a town.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	60	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	75	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	40	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	50	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	55	„	„	„

REVIEW

Some of the speakers have tackled nicely the problem of hostel life versus home life but their arguments are not very new or original in character probably because hostel life in India has not properly developed or because home life in our country is yet in its primitive stage. Except one or two speakers none has given any comparative view of either hostel life or home life in India as well as in other countries. On the whole, the show is not at all satisfactory.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board views with disappointment the arguments of the speakers on both sides of the proposition. The Board

notices the lack of imagination, experience and argumentation of almost all the speakers who have taken part in the present discussion. The Board recommends that the debaters should be more circumspective in their analysis of any problem for discussion whichever may be set before them ; and it recommends further that the debaters should learn more properly the art of discussion before they come up for the Services Selection Board interviews.

Discussion No. 30

WHICH WILL WIN THE RACE— DEMOCRACY OR COMMUNISM ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, may I like to know in the first instance if there is any contest between Democracy and Communism or between Capitalism and Communism ? Do you mean to say that there is no Capitalism in Democracy ? If there be no Democracy in Communism or if there be any Capitalism in Democracy, it is only then, there can be a contest between Democracy and Communism.

In my opinion, Democracy will last for ever while Communism is already dead. Communism is being kept alive superficially by Russia or rather by China because Russia possibly has realised her mistake for having followed Communism so far but China is still lost in the mirage of Communism. To China Communism means dictatorship and violence and no equality of any kind because otherwise how could there be such a great demarcation between the official class and the labour class ; how could there be such a despotic dictator like Mao Tse-tung at the head of the Chinese Communist Party ? Russia is no longer a Communist country although because of the antagonistic attitude of U.S.A. and U.K. Russia has not yet been able to declare her inward policy of democracy which she has been following ever since Khrushchev came into power and also went out of it. All the satellites of the Soviet Union either in Europe or in America or in Asia are essentially democratic in spirit although all of them outwardly put up a show

of Communism just to honour a dead letter just as now-a-days most of the members of the Indian National Congress are showing their formal courtesy or devotion to the teachings of Gandhi ; but in reality neither Russia is communist nor India is Gandhian in spirit. By the very fact that so many congressmen have quitted the Congress and also by the latest General Elections it is perfectly clear that India does not believe in Gandhian philosophy which mainly consists of non-violence and *Satyagraha* or truthfulness. Even Nehru's Non-alignment policy is no longer adopted or pursued by our Government or our people for the simple reason that non alignment is not practicable in a world of alignments. For the same impracticability of Gandhian philosophy, majority of the Indians are gradually giving up their faith in non-violence and truthfulness. Even a devoted *chela* (disciple) of Gandhi like Nehru gave up his faith in the *charka* and the plough, and that is why, he installed, encouraged and actually developed many of the heavy industries during his regime of eighteen years. If Gandhi were alive he would have certainly wondered at the behaviour of Nehru and other devoted followers. So also, if Marx and Lenin were alive, they would have equally wondered how fast Russia has changed, and how quickly even China has become so perverted in his idea and practice of Communism. China accuses Russia of "revisionism" simply because Russia has actually veered round democracy and capitalism. The very fact that Russia pays the highest salaries to the Police and the Armed Forces and also to the top-ranking administrators goes to prove clearly that Russia does not believe in any kind of equality except in words between the ruling class and the working class. Hence, in my opinion, Marxism or Leninism or Communism is dead in Russia, and it is equally dead also in China although some of the Chinese leaders still are crying from the house-top that they are for people's government, people's freedom, people's equality, people's rights. The world knows quite well that whichever country in the world is becoming industrialised must be slowly and gradually capitalistic whether her political constitution is fascist or communist or democratic. Can Russia deny that she is not as highly developed as U.S.A. or U.K. in trade and industries, leaving out the question of science because science has nothing to do with the political constitution of a country

although trade and industries have much to do with it. A country which is highly developed in trade and industries can never be truly communist because communism is not a political creed or theory but an economic cult or doctrine. You will have to admit always that economic equality is smashed to pieces by trade and industries but political equality or democracy is not affected in the least by the development of trade or industries. Ofcourse, democracy may be gradually influenced by trade and industries in the sense that capitalism will take the place of trade and industries and will slowly and gradually vitiate the democratic spirit as it has done in every highly industrialised democratic country.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I do not believe that communism will last forever but it will surely last longer than democracy because democracy has been already vitiated by capitalism while communism is slowly taking the shape of socialism which again will either change its own shape or convert democracy or rather capitalism into democratic socialism. In certain countries like Russia and India democracy has already taken the shape of democratic socialism, and therefore, communism in its original form of Marxism or Leninism has ceased to exist. My preceding speaker while defending democracy has admitted the fact that Russia is no longer a communist country in the Marxist-Leninist sense, and that is why, China has branded Russia as a revisionist ! If the Chinese variety of communism is allowed to spread, it will turn the whole of Asia red sooner or later, not by the magic of its creed but by the sheer force of its military power as also by the impact of its explosive population. India is already socialistically inclined, and she has been considerably influenced by the Russian variety of communism which, in my opinion, is nothing but democratic socialism ; and so, it is quite reasonable to apprehend that Chinese communism will spread more furiously in the East than in the West because the East is proverbially poor while the West is proverbially rich. Chinese communism is likely to strike its root much deeper in Africa than in India or in Japan because Africa is far more backward than India or Japan, and further, China has been spending a lot of money in Africa for the last two decades or more in order to hoist

her red flag over the whole of the African continent. And if my calculation comes correct, Europe will have to give way to communism sooner or later. France is already inclined to China or atleast her present President is very much friendly to Mao Tse-tung as the present President of Pakistan. Ofcourse, if in the meanwhile U.K. can manipulate U.S.A. sufficiently in Viet-Nam not to make any peace, I am sure, a nuclear war or rather a world war will flare up soon in which China will be seriously involved, but not Russia because Russia is already following her policy of aloofness from all European and American politics purposely because she wants to join the democratic bloc, on the one hand, while on the other, she wants to cripple China a little in order to bring her to her senses. So, you see, gentlemen, communism has a good prospect for its propagation further in the East in the near future and also in the West in the long run but in the form of democratic socialism.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I would like to quote the views of Gandhi on democracy and communism so that you will better be able to draw your own conclusion regarding the future of both (democracy and communism) Ofcourse, personally speaking, I strongly believe that democracy will win the race in the long run. I am quoting the words of Gandhi because he was a great democrat as well as a socialist but not a communist in the sense as China understands it. Mark first of all what Pyarelal, one of the closest disciples of Gandhi, says about Gandhi's communism :—

“Gandhiji has often claimed in the course of his discussions with communist and socialist friends that he is a better communist or a socialist than they. Their goal is identical. The difference with regard to the means and the technique employed is, however, fundamental. Changing the structure of society through violence and untruth has no attraction for him because he knows that it will not benefit the dumb millions of India. During the period of his detention in the Aga Khan Palace he studied communist literature. He has a scientific mind, and the knowledge of Communism and Socialism picked up from his talks with his friends and casual reading did not

satisfy him. He read *Das Kapital* and went through some of the other writings of Marx as also of Engels, Lenin and Stalin. He read some books about the Reds in China too, and at the end of it, was convinced more than ever that Communism of his conception was the only thing that could bring relief to the suffering humanity. In his *Ashram* and the institutions that are being run under his guidance and inspiration, the ruling principle is: "To each according to his need, from each according to his capacity." His *Ashrams* are thus themselves experiments in Communism based on non-violence and Indian village conditions. In Sevagram Ashram the dictum is followed that the inmates are there only on the sufferance of the village people. A cantankerous fellow felled some Ashram trees for his use as fuel though he had no title to them. Another encroached upon the right of way through his field although he had accepted compensation for it. No legal redress was applied for. An announcement was made that the *Ashram* people were there only for the service of the village folk and that they would go away elsewhere if the latter did not want them. Ultimately, the trouble-makers were persuaded by their fellow-villagers to behave reasonably. In Sabharwal *Ashram*, the women inmates not only merged their domestic kitchens into the communal kitchen and continued to run it but were even persuaded, not only to take children other than their own into their families and to look after them like their own but also to let their children be looked after by others. Here was an experiment of pulling down of the walls and emancipation of women without the disintegration of family life—a veritable revolution less the anarchy. But as a friend humorously remarked after dining in the common kitchen of the Talimi Sangh which feeds more than a hundred individuals, "Gandhiji calls it a *rasoda* (kitchen) and it sounds common place; the Communists would call it a 'Commune' and everybody would be impressed by it." Did not the good old knight of Addison wonder how a certain play could be a tragedy since there was not a line in it but he could understand?

"What exactly do you mean by economic equality," Gandhiji was asked at the Constructive Workers' Conference during his recent tour of Madras. "and what is statutory trusteeship as conceived by you?" Gandhiji's reply was that

economic equality of his conception did not mean that every one would literally have the same amount. It simply meant that everybody should have enough for his or her needs. For instance, he required two *shawls* in winter whereas his grand nephew Kanu Gandhi, who stayed with him and was like his own son, did not require any warm clothing whatsoever. Gandhiji required goat's milk, oranges and other fruits. Kanu could do with ordinary food. He envied Kanu but there was no point in it. Kanu was a young man whereas he was an old man of seventy six. The monthly expense of his food was far more than that of Kanu but that did not mean that there was economic inequality between them. The elephant needs a thousand times more food than the ant, but that is not an indication of inequality. So the real meaning of economic equality was: "To each according to his need". That was the definition of Marx. If a single man demanded as much as a man with wife and four children that would be a violation of economic equality.

"Let no one try to justify the glaring difference between the classes and the masses, the prince and the pauper, by saying that the former need more. That will be idle sophistry and a travesty of my argument, he continued. "The contrast between the rich and the poor today is a painful sight. The poor villagers are exploited by the foreign government and also by their own countrymen, the city-dwellers. They produce the food and go hungry. They produce milk and their children have to go without it. It is disgraceful. Every one must have a balanced diet, a decent house to live in, facilities for the education of his children and adequate medical relief." That constituted his picture of economic equality. He did not want to taboo everything above and beyond the bare necessities but they must come after the essential needs of the poor are satisfied. First things must come first.

As for the present owners of wealth, they would have to make their choice between class war and voluntarily converting themselves into trustees of their wealth. They would be allowed to retain the stewardship of their possessions and to use their talent to increase the wealth, not for their own sakes, but for the sake of the nation, and therefore, without exploitation. The state would regulate the rate of commission which

they would get commensurate with the service rendered and its value to society. Their children would inherit the stewardship only if they proved their fitness for it. "Supposing India becomes a free country tomorrow," he concluded, "all the capitalists will have an opportunity of becoming statutory trustees." But such a statute will not be imposed from above. It will have to come from below. When the people understand the implications of trusteeship and the atmosphere is ripe for it, the people themselves, beginning with *gram panchayats*, will begin to introduce such statutes. Such a thing coming from below is easy to swallow. Coming from above, it is liable to prove a dead weight.

"The Socialists and the Communists say, they can do nothing to bring about economic equality today. They will just carry on propaganda in its favour, and to that end, they believe in generating and accentuating hatred. They say, when they get control over the State, they will enforce equality. Under my plan the State will be there to carry out the will of the people, not to dictate to them or force them to do its will. I shall bring about economic equality through non-violence, by converting the people to my point of view by harnessing the forces of love as against hatred. I will not wait till I have converted the whole society to my view but will straight-way make a beginning with myself. It goes without saying that I can not hope to bring about economic equality of my conception if I am the owner of fifty motor cars or even of ten *bighas* land. For that I have to reduce myself to the level of the poorest of the poor. That is what I have been trying to do for the last fifty years or more, and so I claim to be a foremost Communist although I make use of cars and other facilities offered to me by the rich. They have no hold on me and I can shed them at a moment's notice, if the interests of the masses demand it".

So, gentlemen, you have listened to the words of Gandhi as well as of his disciple Pyarelal about Gandhi's conception of Communism and Socialism. I too hold the same opinion, and hence, I believe that Communism or Socialism will survive democracy provided communism or socialism does not mean violence of untruthfulness, provided everybody gets according

to his need, and provided also the rich as well as the common people, the official class (ruling class), as well as the working class practise and not merely profess non-violence, non-possession and truthfulness.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, the third speaker puts a big condition on the continuance or survival of communism or socialism in the human world, and that condition can never be fulfilled because it is very difficult to judge correctly the economic needs of the people who are divided into so many trades and professions—engineers, writers, scientists, artists, mechanics, cultivators, administrators, etc. the minimum needs of whom would vary from time to time just as they would be enlarging the field of their vocations and also just as their families would multiply. Then again, it would be most difficult, if not altogether impossible, to control some of the basic instincts of human nature, namely, greed, ambition, power, selfishness etc none of which instincts would permit any kind of equality for the various human individuals whether they are in a democratic or a communist or socialist country. So, as far as I can see, communism as an economic creed or theory can never flourish whether the political constitution behind it is democratic or not. As one of the preceding speakers has already pointed out, in all highly industrialised countries, capitalism is bound to grow strong; and as democracy is not opposed to capitalism, it (capitalism) is bound to flourish under all conditions of life, whether in poverty or in prosperity. Capitalism, in my opinion, has a much better chance of flourishing in poorer countries because it is easier to suck the blood of the poor than of the rich, it is easier to fool the poor than the rich, it is easier to console the poor by telling them lies namely that all the assets of their country would be invested in their State on their behalf as all the communist and the socialist countries are fooling their working class with such catch-phrases as co-operative farming, co-operative banking and co-operative all other national assets on behalf of the people. But the working class of the communist or socialist countries do not realise that the ruling class is always different from the working class, that the capitalist class is always the ruling class, and that the working class is always the exploited class.

I further believe that industrialisation can never be stopped unless science is altogether choked to death, and trade also can not be checked in its progress if industrialisation also is allowed to progress; and further, capitalism can never be stopped so long science, trade, industries are going forward. Therefore, it is idle to indulge in the wishful thinking that democracy will die because of its capitalism, while Communism or Socialism will survive because of their fundamental principle of economic equality. In the very first instance, there can never be any economic equality; in the second instance, the ruling class can never cease to be ambitious; in the third instance, the traders and the industrialists can never cease to be exploiters; and hence, where is that blooming prospect of communism or socialism?

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I will quote a few words of Gandhi about his conception of democracy, and you will be able to judge whether or not democracy will survive in India or anywhere else in the world. Mark the words of Gandhi :—

“My notion of democracy is that under it the weakest should have the same opportunity as the strongest. That can never happen except through non-violence. True democracy or the *Swaraj* of the masses can never come through untruthful and violent means, for the simple reason that the natural corollary to their use would be to remove all opposition through the suppression or extermination of the antagonists. That does not make for individual freedom. Individual freedom can have the fullest play only under a regime of unadulterated *ahimsa*. The fact that there are so many men still alive in the world shows that it is based not on the force of arms but on the force of truth or love. Therefore, the greatest and most unimpeachable evidence of the success of this force is to be found in the fact that, in spite of the wars of the world, it still lives on. Self-government depends entirely upon our own internal strength, upon our ability to fight against the heaviest odds. Indeed, self-government which does not require that continuous striving to attain it and to sustain it, is not worth the name. I have, therefore, endeavoured to show both in word and deed that political self-government—that is self-

government for a large number of men and women—is no better than individual self-government, and therefore, it is to be attained by precisely the the same means that are required for individual self-government or self-rule. The true source of rights is duty. If we all discharge our duties, right will not be far to seek. If leaving duties unperformed we run after rights, they will escape us like a will o-the-wisp. The more we pursue them, the farther will they fly. To me political power is not an end but one of the means of enabling people to better their condition in every department of life. Political power means capacity to regulate national life through national representatives. If national life becomes so perfect as to become self regulated, no representation becomes necessary. There is then a state of enlightened anarchy. In such a state every one is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal State, therefore, there is no political power because there is no State. But the ideal is never fully realised in life. Hence, the classical statement of Thoreau that that government is best which governs the least. My idea of society is that while we are born equal, meaning that we have a right to equal opportunity, all have not the same capacity. It is, in the nature of things, impossible. For instance, all cannot have the same height or colour or degree of intelligence etc. Therefore, in the nature of things, some will have ability to earn more and others less. People with talents will have more, and they will utilize their talents for this purpose. If they utilize kindly, they will be performing the work of the State. Such people exist as trustees, on no other terms. I would allow a man of intellect to earn more, I would not cramp his talent. But the bulk of his greater earnings must be used for the good of the State, just as the income of all earning sons of the father go to the common family fund. They would have their earnings only as trustees. It may be that I would fail miserably in this. But that is what I am sailing for.

“A born democrat is a born disciplinarian. Democracy comes naturally to him who is habituated normally to yield willing obedience to all laws, human or divine. I claim to be a democrat both by instinct and training. Let those who are ambitious to serve democracy qualify themselves by satisfying

first this acid test of democracy. Moreover, a democrat must be utterly selfless. He must think and dream, not in terms of self or party, but only of democracy. Only then does he acquire the right of civil disobedience. I do not want anybody to give up his convictions or to suppress himself. I do not believe that a healthy and honest difference of opinion will injure our cause. But opportunism, camouflage or patched-up compromises certainly will. If you must dissent, you should take care that your opinions voice your innermost convictions and are not intended merely as a convenient party cry. I value individual freedom but you must not forget that man is essentially a social being. He has risen to his present status by learning to adjust his individualism to the requirements of social progress. Unrestrained individualism is the law of the beast of the jungle. We have learnt to strike the mean between individual freedom and social restraint. Willing submission to social restraint for the sake of the well being of the whole society enriches both the individual and the society of which one is a member. I do not believe in the doctrine of the greatest good of the greatest number. It means in its nakedness that in order to achieve the supposed good of fifty-one per cent, the interest of forty-nine per cent may be, or rather, should be sacrificed. It is a heartless doctrine and has done harm to humanity. The only real dignified human doctrine is the greatest good of all, and this can only be achieved by uttermost self-sacrifice.

“Self-government means continuous effort to be independent of government control whether it is foreign government or whether it is national. *Swaraj* government will be a sorry affair if people look up to it for the regulation of every detail of life. The rule of majority has a narrow application i.e. one should yield to the majority in matters of detail. But it is slavery to be amenable to the majority, no matter what its decisions are. Democracy is not a State in which people act like sheep. Under democracy individual liberty of opinion and action is jealously guarded. The true democrat is he who with purely non violent means defends his liberty, and therefore, his country's and ultimately, that of the whole of mankind. Democracy, disciplined and enlightened, is the finest thing in the world. A democracy prejudiced, ignorant, superstitious will

land itself in chaos and may be self-destroyed. Democracy and violence can ill go together. The States that are today nominally democratic have either to become frankly totalitarian or, if they are to become truly democratic, they must become courageously non-violent. It is a blasphemy to say that non-violence can only be practised by individuals and never by nations which are composed of individuals."

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	65	out of 100 marks
Second Speaker	„	30	„ „ „
Third Speaker	„	65	„ „ „
Fourth Speaker	„	55	„ „ „
Fifth Speaker	„	65	„ „ „

REVIEW

Some of the candidates have thrown new lights on the problem of democracy *versus* Communism, and some of their arguments are also quite convincing. But one or two of the speakers have quoted at length the words of Gandhi in connection with Communism and democracy. Such quotations should not be encouraged unless indispensable.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has nothing to comment except to say that our country is a democratic country and that it shall never be a communist country whether Russia is with us or China is not with us, that we are not going to be influenced by any political cult; and therefore, the Board desires that all the youths of our country, on whom the future of the nation depends, should be democratic in spirit in the very same sense in which Gandhi, the Father of our Nation, was a democrat in spirit as well as in practice.

Discussion No. 31

IS A GRADUATE WIFE A BLESSING OR A CURSE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, a graduate wife is a misfit in the Indian family as well as in the Indian society and as such, she is a curse and not a blessing at all for the following reasons :—

1. A graduate wife being highly educated does not like to work in the kitchen or attend any other domestic work.

2. A graduate wife cannot pull on with a half-educated husband who may be a shop-keeper or a businessman or even a clerk in some office.

3. A graduate wife generally does not know how to cook food, how to look after the children, how to attend the sick-bed, how to attend any of the primary household duties.

4. A graduate wife is generally proud of her high education, and so, she looks down upon everybody else in the family whoever is not a graduate or highly educated. She is something of a snob. She cannot even honour her own husband if he happens to be inferior to her in education.

5. A graduate wife is highly expensive because she develops a taste for all sorts of fine things—fine clothes, fine furniture, fine decorations, fine food and fine everything which every husband cannot possibly afford to meet.

6. A graduate wife is often insolent to her superiors or rather to her elderly relations *e.g.* her mother-in-law, father-in-law, her husband's elder brothers or sisters etc.

7. A graduate wife is more interested in outdoor

activities such as club life, sports and games, pictures, picnic, etc. none of which her husband can possibly afford.

8. A graduate wife often wants to visit her friends neglecting her household duties and even her own children, and therefore, her house becomes a place of disorderliness, indiscipline and unhappiness. She wants also to be visited by friends for which she wants more money for their entertainment which possibly her husband cannot afford.

9. A graduate wife invariably wants to go to some hill station during summer because she cannot stand the heat, and all such extra expenses her husband cannot always easily afford.

10. A graduate wife is generally rude, unkind, unsympathetic towards little children, towards domestic servants, and that is why, nobody can find any solace in such a mistress of the house.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, all that my preceding speaker has said about a graduate wife is not at all true. It is not at all a fact that a graduate wife does not know any kind of household work or does not want to do it. There are hundreds of instances in which a graduate wife works in the kitchen and even washes clothes and utensils; and of course, she takes care of her own children. She being highly educated develops quite a good sense which an illiterate or a half-educated wife does not ordinarily develop; and hence, a graduate wife can adjust himself to her husband's family far more easily than any other wife. A graduate wife having studied economics, domestic science, nursing and all other essential subjects becomes far more helpful to the husband and to his family than any other wife can possibly be. A graduate wife is mostly considerate, kind-hearted and sympathetic, because she knows that it is not good to be unkind to any body. She is never insolent or impertinent to her husband's elderly relations because she knows manners much more than an ordinary wife can possibly know.

A graduate wife is often far more helpful to the children as their private tutor, and to her husband by earning extra

wages from some office or school or shop. In our country most of the people who marry and multiply children are generally either clerks or school masters who being always ill-paid can not possibly make their both ends meet unless their wives can earn some extra money ; and that is how a graduate wife is a great blessing to a poor family. An illiterate wife is always a burden to the husband. She can only do all the household work provided she knows such work and provided she keeps perfectly fit in health. You need not be surprised, gentlemen, if I tell you for your information that half-educated or completely illiterate wives are generally rude, insolent, impertinent, to their husband's elderly relations probably because such wives suffer from some kind of inferiority complex from which fortunately graduate wives seldom suffer. Graduate wives know how to keep the house clean because they have got a great sense of cleanliness which the illiterate or half-educated wives are not expected to possess because they have not studied any book on health or hygiene, they have never had the occasion to decorate any house. A graduate wife is just like a decoration piece in the family because she knows how to attend visitors, how to entertain them etc. whereas an illiterate or half-educated wife does not know even the common social etiquette. A graduate wife is likely to be respected and obeyed far more than any other kind of wife because everybody has got some amount of respect for high education. You can take out your graduate wife anywhere you like; you will not feel her at all as a burden because she can conduct herself quite properly every where whether in the rural areas or in the biggest cities or in the clubs or in the picture-houses or in the theatres or in social functions or public festivities. Can you expect your illiterate wife to travel alone by train or by bus, to take care of your children or of luggage during any kind of journey ? You will have to look after her otherwise she will get lost in the journey. That is the real penalty of owning an illiterate wife !

Third Speaker

But gentlemen, an illiterate wife is perfectly safe at home. She is not likely to elope with anybody during your absence from home ! A graduate wife is very likely to have had several love affairs during her school or college or university life, and

hence, she develops a flirting nature which is not a very happy thing for conjugal life. Everybody has an eye on educated girls and particularly on graduate girls because they understand more easily everything connected with love or sex, and besides, there is some amount of smartness about graduate girls which illiterate or half educated girls can never have ; and that is one of the chief reasons why everybody wants to have a graduate girl for his companion. An illiterate girl can be no companion to an educated husband except in sex-communion but sex-communion is not the only thing for which people marry.

That is why, gentlemen, I fear to have a graduate wife at home particularly when I am in the office or out on tour. One has to put an extra watch over a graduate wife because she is unusually shrewd, because she knows how to deceive her husband easily, and how to carry on with secret love affairs. You can easily detect an illiterate wife if she tries to be faithless to you, if she makes love to anybody at your back ; but you can not have any control over a graduate wife who is often more than a match for you in every respect, particularly in the matter of making love to any body secretly.

Then again, an illiterate wife is contented with little things while a graduate wife is unusually ambitious, and therefore, your means may not be sufficient at all to satisfy her ambition. Every woman, when any of her desires remains unsatisfied seeks invariably some opportunity or other to satisfy that unfulfilled desire. A graduate wife's desires are unlimited. She wants to put on decent or fashionable clothes ; she wants to have her house nicely furnished ; she wants to go to the pictures atleast twice a week ; she wants to eat or drink something at some restaurant atleast once a week ; she may have many other expensive hobbies, and if you cannot cater those hobbies you are a doomed husband ! She will invariably seek other partners who can satisfy all such desires ; ofcourse, she will not divorce you quickly because she is clever enough to suck you as well as suck any body else. It is always easier and safer too for a married woman to do anything which is not lawful but it is not so in the case of a widow or a spinster or a divorced wife. Marriage is a good passport for both man and

woman, and a wife with her husband alive and not divorced is perfectly safe in all her illicit connections with all other persons than her own husband. Hence, I say, a graduate wife is a dangerous, a very unreliable partner in life !

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I seriously object to all the remarks that my preceding speaker has made regarding a graduate wife. All that he has said is a downright lie. If a graduate wife is so unreliable, so deceitful, so faithless to her husband, I should say with much greater emphasis that an illiterate wife is hundred times more so. A graduate wife has got every sense of honour and self-respect, and that is why, she would think hundred times before she would stoop so low and commit such follies. After all, high education must have given her some amount of self-control which is itself a great safeguard against all sorts of unguarded folly. But an illiterate woman, like an animal, is urged by her instinct which she obeys readily whether it is good or bad. She has not developed any sense of honour or self-respect, and hence, she can run away even with a domestic servant ! But a graduate girl, if she at all stoops low, she will never run away with any man who is inferior to her husband in any respect. That is the difference between an educated girl and an uneducated girl. It is absolutely wrong to say that an uneducated wife is not ambitious or is not fond of fine clothes or of ornaments or of fine furniture, or that she has no hobby like going to the pictures or visiting the restaurants for occasional feeds or drinks. Illiterate women or uneducated women are more fond of cosmetics such as powder, cream, lipstick, rouge etc. Do you not notice, Sirs, how the village girls are becoming fashionable these days although most of them are practically illiterate. Just compare them with the college or the university girls. You will rarely find the educated girls fond of fashionable things chiefly because they are used to such things in their parents' homes and also because by virtue of their education they have realised the emptiness of such things as fine clothes, ornaments, cosmetics. Ofcourse, they want to live a decent life but a decent life does not necessarily mean a fashionable life.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, we can speak nothing in favour of uneducated wives ; they are absolutely useless except as cooks or maid-servants or child-bearing machines ! But we can speak everything in favour of graduate wives, because they are a great help to their husbands as well as to their children. India is a poor country. One man's income is not sufficient to bear all the expenses of a family. The old joint-family system is no longer in existence. Hence, it is absolutely necessary that both the husband and the wife should earn something in order to maintain the family. How can an illiterate or a half educated wife earn anything ? It is only a graduate wife who can now-a-days get an employment anywhere as a teacher, as a clerk, as a typist, as a private secretary etc , and she can easily earn as much as her husband if not sometimes more than he earns. How can a graduate wife be a curse instead of being a blessing under the present circumstances of life in our country."

Then again, the problem of education of the little children becomes more acute when they have got to be admitted to school which is highly expensive particularly when three or four children have to be educated at the same time. It is said that the mother is the best educator of her children ; but how can she educate them if she is herself uneducated ? Therefore, now-a-days, in every poor family educated wives are absolutely necessary ; a graduate mother can educate her children atleast upto the High School standard, and that she can do it much more efficiently than even the best schools and best teachers can possibly do. You are perfectly aware, gentlemen, how expensive education is these days, particularly in the Anglo-Indian schools ; and so far the Indian schools are concerned, teaching in the lower classes *i.e.* in the Kindergarten classes is really hopeless. The little children in these Indian schools learn nothing except bad manners and indiscipline. But how many parents can afford to send all their children to Anglo-Indian schools ? Very few indeed. But if there is a graduate mother in a family, she can greatly reduce the educational expenses of the children atleast for five or six years which would be a great help to the father.

But what is the worth of an uneducated wife ? Practically

nil in every respect except, ofcourse, in the matter of domestic work. But domestic work should not be regarded as important as the education of children. If the children do not get any proper education either at home or at school, they would be a regular nuisance to the family in the long run.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	55	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	45	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	50	„	„	„

REVIEW

There is not much difference in the performance of the various speakers. All the arguments put forward by the speakers are old and hackneyed, and as such, they have no fresh appeal. The very proposition is rather not proper in the sense that it admits of no opposition, although certain childish arguments have been advanced by the opposition party. On the whole, the entire discussion loses its tempo almost at every step because of the absurd character of the proposition itself.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has nothing to comment because there is nothing interesting about the discussion or about the topic itself. In future it is expected that some better topics would be placed before the candidates to lend some sauce to their discussion!

Discussion No. 32

IS DIVORCE A BLESSING OR A CURSE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, the Divorce Act was passed in India just three years ago, and that also against a lot of opposition. Indians were never in favour of divorce firstly because the Hindus regard their marriage as a sacrament and not as a social contract; secondly, the Hindus from the earliest days used to have child marriage; thirdly because the Hindus used to have polygamy; fourthly because the Hindus never complained that they were unhappy in their married life, and as such they had no reason for thinking of divorce as the Christians had been thinking of divorce even in their earliest days. It is rather surprising that in arranged or negotiated marriage the partners do not feel any necessity of divorce while in love marriage or courtship marriage the partners feel the need of divorce. But why is it so? Do you not think that divorce is merely a plea for changing partners? If not, how is it that after a long period of courtship, during which the marrying partners are expected to know much of each other, they complain of differences between themselves shortly after marriage? In the case of arranged or negotiated marriage the partners can not have any chance of knowing each other at all because the marriage is settled by the parents or the guardians, hence, there may be sufficient reason for the discovery of differences between the partners after their marriage. But as a matter of fact, in the earlier days, very few of the Hindus discovered any of serious differences between the partners which would require any kind of separation between them. That is why, there was no

proposal for divorce or no law passed on it till three years ago ; but even then, there was a fierce opposition to the Divorce Bill in the Parliament although Nehru by his sheer personality carried it through and passed it as an Act !

In my opinion, divorce is essential in many cases particularly when the parents or guardians settle the marriage of their children or wards. There is one pernicious system among the Hindus—the dowry system—which influences greatly the choice of the parents or the guardians in settling the marriage of their children. The guardians often overlook the desirability of the match or rather the defects or deficiencies of the bride and the groom in preference to the dowry paid by the bride's party to the groom's party. Then again, the guardians do not at all take into consideration of the likes and dislikes of their sons or daughters, and consequently, soon after marriage those overlooked likes and dislikes are accentuated or rather become prominent in the eyes of the married partners ; but if there be no Divorce Act, naturally, the disagreeing partners have to carry on their unhappy married life until they reach some point where either suicide on the part of the bride or criminal neglect or brutal treatment on the part of groom becomes quite apparent. Would you regard such married life happy in any sense ? Hence, I say that divorce is really a blessing.

Second Speaker

But, gentlemen, just consider seriously the actual cases of divorce which have been occurring in Europe and America, and consider also what benefit or injury the divorcing parties have been deriving ever since the Divorce Law came into operation in their countries. In U.S.A. particularly hundreds of divorce cases are coming up every week before the Courts of Law, and most of these cases have very flimsy grounds, and they are brought up too soon after marriage, which generally takes place after a long period of courtship. Do you mean to say that in most of the cases, the partners could not discover any of the points of their mutual disagreement during the period of courtship ? It can not be so because both the partners engage themselves in courtship when they have attained their maturity in age otherwise their marriage would be illeg

and they would be prosecuted by law. Therefore, it is perfectly clear that in U.S.A. or even in Europe most of the divorces are due to the licentious (or polygamous) habit. Men and women both have become more or less like beasts particularly in the progressive countries where money or leisure are making them so passionate and licentious. But in India it is of course a different story. In our country, woman has been always under male tyranny. Every law, every social convention is made to suit the convenience of man. The Hindu males could discard their wives on any pretext and also marry several times but Hindu females were never permitted to discard their husbands or to remarry even on solid justifiable grounds. That is why, I say that the Divorce Act has been a blessing to our women. As soon as the Divorce Act was passed several thousands of the Hindu wives sued their husbands for a divorce; and this incident is rather quite significant in the sense that Hindu women had been really suffering due to the absence of the Divorce Law but now they are feeling mightily relieved. The Hindu males are unfortunately now on a disadvantageous ground; but what can they do when for the past so many centuries they have been always enjoying the privilege of discarding their wives and also of remarrying as many wives as they liked?

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I am afraid, the Divorce Act will be soon abused as much in India as it is being abused in America and Europe. The abuse, of course, would be chiefly due to undue freedom between the two sexes whether before or after marriage. This kind of unlimited freedom takes away practically the whole romance of marriage. In our country, marriage is the greatest thrill because in most cases the bride and the bridegroom meet each other on the bridal night for the first time in their life. This thrill, this touch of romance the Americans and the Europeans totally miss because of their pre-marriage intimacies between the two sexes. The divorce cases in these two continents are chiefly due to post-marriage intimacies with other partners than their own married partners!

Divorce would be a real blessing if there is no pre-

marriage courtship, if there is no pre-marriage sex intimacy, if there be no post-marriage freedom between the two sexes because every divorce would be based on solid and justifiable grounds and not on mere pretexts as now-a days most of the divorces in U.S.A are based. Both men and women have become beastly in the sense that they live only for sex. Even bread has been put into the background. There is no greater attraction of life than sex in the modern world. I for myself often think that soon marriage would be totally abolished from the human world, and in its place, there would be nothing but "dating" and mating! U.S.A. is already fed up with "dating", and I fear, she will be soon fed up with mating too!

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I support divorce on the following grounds only :—

1. If any of the partners is impotent or sterile.
2. If any of the partners is an addict to drinking or gambling or prostitution.
3. If any of the partners proves to be faithless to the other partner.
4. If any of the partners treats the other partner brutally or mercilessly.
5. If any of the partners is criminally neglectful of his or her primary duties—for man to earn money and for woman to manage home.
6. If any of the partners abuses the other partner in a filthy language.
7. If any of the partners does not get from the other partner either personal protection or attention in times of need or sufficient food and cloth and shelter.
8. If any of the partners suffers from any of the venereal diseases,
9. If any of the partners happens to be a confirmed criminal or a debauch.

10. If any of the partners misuses the fidelity or trust of the other partner.

11. If no child is born to the partners due to some physiological or anatomical defect of any of them.

12. If any of the partners happens to suffer from any abnormal type of sexual perversion such as homo-sexuality, sadism, masochism, fetichism, necrophilism, etc.

As a matter of fact, the above are the valid grounds on which one can secure a divorce under the British or the American law. There may be a few other grounds also which we have not mentioned. Now judging all the above grounds we feel that every one of them is a good reason, a sufficient justification to entitle any of the married partners to the right of divorce.

Whatever Hindu law has to say in the matter of marriage, it should be regarded, in my opinion, as a separable social contract and not as an indissoluble tie of sacrament. You must be knowing, gentlemen, that the Hindus have been treating their marriage throughout as a sacrament particularly for the females depriving them of the right of divorce or remarriage, but not for the males who can discard their duly married wives on any flimsy ground and also can remarry any number of times. Do you not regard such laws or customs or traditions as most unjust and unfair; and yet the Hindu women have been bearing these insults and injuries for the past so many centuries. For this reason, the Hindu women are looked upon by the Western eyes as good as angels. What great tyrannies our innocent women have been suffering in the hands of their cruel and selfish husbands nobody except the sufferer alone can imagine. Just consider how a Hindu wife works day and night like a drudge at home, what great care she takes of her husband and her children and even all the relatives of her husband whoever happen to stay with her ! A Hindu wife gets up early in the morning, cooks the food of the family, bathes and dresses all the little children and feeds them as well as their father to send them in time either to school or to office. And even then she does not have any rest if the husband happens to be financially poor and can not afford to engage any servant for cleaning the

utensils, or for washing the clothes, or for doing any other odd job at home. She works daily up to one or two o'clock in the afternoon, and then, she can possibly have her own meals. And soon after taking her meals, she has to repeat the routine of her daily work again till eleven or twelve o'clock in the night when possibly she can go to bed. And so far the Hindu husband is concerned, he is the most privileged being on earth because he gets all the care and attention from his wife in the day as well as in the night, and in order to prove his superiority as her overlord, he orders her to do all sorts of odd jobs at home as if she is her bond slave ! The Hindu husband has all the rights of drinking, gambling and visiting the public brothels or even maintaining private concubines in order to satisfy his inordinate sex desire ; but if the wife happens to peep through the window of her house in order to catch a glimpse of the passersby in the street, or if she happens to go upstairs on the roof of her dwelling-place in order to breathe fresh air or to have some change of sights, she is atonce suspected by her husband of infidelity or corruption ! That has been the real position of the Hindu women whether married or unmarried or widows. Under such circumstances, who would not hail the Divorce Act as the greatest blessing particularly to the Hindu wives who have been suffering male tyranny and male injustice for centuries ?

Fifth Speaker

I am afraid, gentlemen, whatever has been spoken by the fourth speaker about Hindu wives and male tyranny is nothing but an exaggeration of facts. All Hindu husbands are not just as they have been described by my preceding speaker. How many of the husbands in any part of the world have an inordinate sex desire ? How many of them can afford to visit public brothels or maintain private concubines, particularly, when we consider the *per capita* income of the Hindu males in our country. The Hindu wife in a poor family has undoubtedly to work very hard ; but do you mean to say that the husband does not work at all ? He too has to attend all sorts of outdoor jobs other than attending his office or going to the shop or attending the corn-fields. Then again, formerly, the Hindu wives were all illiterate, and hence, possibly they could not earn a penny in order to supplement the poor income of their

husbands. Naturally, they had to work very hard at home just as their poor husbands too had to work no less out-of-doors.

Ofcourse, the Hindu law governing marriage, succession of property etc. particularly in the case of the women was really hard if not positively cruel and unfair ; but then, the Hindu wives were never treated as mere drudges at home and given no liberties. On the contrary, they were *de facto* the uncrowned queens of their household, because they were in charge of the cash, of all the valuables in the family coffers ; they were also the full overlords of the domestic servants and the dictators of their children and the husbands too ! Nowhere in the world you will find so much of female supremacy over male bondage ! And yet how is it that my preceding speaker complains of the drudgery and slavery of the Hindu women, particularly, of the Hindu wives ?

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, in my honest opinion, the Divorce law is not at all necessary in any part of the world, what to speak of India alone. The right of divorce has brought about so much sex indiscipline or licence in the modern world. Formerly, when there was no Divorce Law, how many married couples, in any part of the world, were really unhappy, and how many of them wanted to have a change in partnership ? Probably very few indeed, whether their marriage was love marriage or negotiated marriage, child marriage or adult marriage.

It is a fact, gentlemen, that the sex instinct is the strongest instinct in both man and woman, and the more latitude (freedom) you will give to it, the more hungry and ravenous it will become, as it has actually become in both Europe and America with the advent of the Divorce Law ! The Divorce Law has made marriage cheap, the bond of fidelity a farce, and conjugal happiness a fiction. Is there any real peace or harmony in any of the American or European homes ? Is there any touch of love between the parents and the children ? How can they love each other when they know that the parents or the children are not their own after so many divorces in one life-time ? If any of the children enquires from the mother, "Where is my daddy ?", the mother points to her new partner from whom

the child turns away his face and says, "No, he is not my daddy!" When the same question is put to the father by any of the children, and when the father points to his new partner, he gets the same sort of reply from the child, "No, she is not my mummy!" That is the sort of home life and home relationship the Americans and the Europeans are having these days ever since the advent of the Divorce Law! Do you really envy such life? If you do, mum is the word for me.

Seventh Speaker

But, gentlemen, just consider for a while certain cases of radical disagreement between the married partners, and let me know sincerely your opinion either for or against divorce. I do not think for a moment that the conditions for a divorce as laid down in the Divorce Laws of America or Europe are flimsy or unjust from any point of view. Please review carefully the grounds for a divorce as pointed out by the fourth speaker, and then, you will be in a position to judge if divorce is necessary or not, if divorce is a blessing or a curse. Do you not, gentlemen, throw out a food which has become rotten or a garment which has been eaten up by moths or insects? If you do, what harm is there in divorcing your partner who has become intolerable to you from many points of view? Why should you poison the happiness of your life for the sake of a milestone which has been tied round your neck by your parents or guardians in your childhood or in adult age? How can you pull on with a partner who always moves away from you like a tangent? How can you live with your husband or wife from day to day, from month to month, and from year to year if he or she does not really love you, or if he or she fights with you day and night, or if he or she has some illicit connection with any other partner than yourself, or if he or she treats you always more cruelly than a beast? Like other laws that come in between the law-abiding persons and the criminals, the Divorce Law also should come in between you and your partner for restoring your peace of mind and happiness. In my opinion, therefore, divorce is definitely a blessing and not a curse.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	60	out	of	100	marks
Second Speaker	"	50	"	"	"	"
Third Speaker	"	40	"	"	"	"
Fourth Speaker	"	70	"	"	"	"
Fifth Speaker	"	55	"	"	"	"
Sixth Speaker	"	40	"	"	"	"
Seventh Speaker	"	30	"	"	"	"

REVIEW

Some of the speakers have done very well while one or two speakers have been unusually short although their arguments are perfectly sound on both sides of the proposition. The Divorce Law should be regarded as one of the most important laws for the regulation of human relations and for the promotion of human happiness ; it should be most judiciously handled by the Courts of Law otherwise it will breed licence, indiscipline and unhappiness.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board sincerely congratulates the speakers for tackling so successfully such a difficult problem as divorce. Although one or two speakers have cut short the discussion probably for want of arguments yet their performance, on the whole, is quite satisfactory. The Board does not hold any special opinion on the problem except that divorce in certain cases is really a blessing while in others it is an abuse of justice and human relations.

Discussion No. 33

**THE BIBLE SAYS, "INCREASE AND MULTIPLY."
WOULD YOU NOT RECOMMEND FAMILY PLANNING
AGAINST THIS COMMANDMENT ?**

First Speaker

Gentlemen, when Jesus Christ advised his countrymen to increase and multiply, it meant that during his time, the population of his country was thin or scarce. But times have changed ever since those early days—the population has abnormally increased in every part of the world; the ways of life have changed particularly in the progressive countries; the ideas also about marriage, sex relations etc have considerably changed.

Any how, in my opinion, I consider family planning (birth control) as absolutely necessary in our country as well as in China but not so much in America or Europe where the population has been rather dwindling. Bertrand Russell, the great scientist and philosopher, has said over and over again that in the Western world the number of the old people is increasing because modern food and science have lengthened the lease of life particularly in those countries where medical science has made any remarkable progress, as it has done, in U S A , U S S R , France, England, Germany etc. Bertrand Russell has further pointed out that the explosive population of China and India will be a menace to the human world in the near future *i.e* by the end of the present century because there will be such an acute scarcity of food in these two countries that there will be a great war between the East and the West merely on the problem of food !

So far our country is concerned, we are having every year an acute shortage of food due to drought or untimely rain fall or due to the lack of a sufficient irrigation system or due to our unscientific agriculture, or even due to our multiplying population from year to year, which has now exceeded five hundred millions ! We have been begging food from every corner of the world under certain stringent or humiliating conditions. That is why, if we do not immediately follow an extensive programme of family planning, our country shall soon face a great national disaster !

You must be knowing, gentlemen, the *per capita* income of our country ; it is hardly fifty rupees per month ; and with this lean income you have to feed and clothe atleast four or five hungry mouths in every family particularly when the prices of most of the essential commodities have shot up four hundred times during the space of there decades only. Whatever may be the cause or causes of this abnormal rise in the prices, we have got to make our both ends meet with our extremely limited income, and this we can possibly do if we, first of all, put a ban on indiscriminate marriage, and then, on reckless procreation ! We are multiplying our race just like mice and lice as the Chinese are doing these days !

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker finds fault with "the biological necessity" of man and woman but not with mal-administration, mal-production, mal-distribution of so many things and commodities in our country. I want to know from you, gentlemen, why did we undertake so many development projects all atonce during the last two decades by begging, borrowing or stealing money from every corner of the world ? Why did we not follow the advice or warning of Mahatma Gandhi who believed only in the *charka* and the plough and also in *brahmacharya* ? Why did we undertake so much in a hurry to industrialise our country without sounding our financial or other material resources ? Why did we not develop our agriculture scientifically or extensively ? Have we not plenty of cultivable lands in our country ? Why have we allowed them all to go sterile ? Why should we not have

taken the strictest measure against the horders or black-marketers of the essential goods or commodities, particularly, our food? What have we been doing these twenty years ever since our Independence? Simply fighting for power and quarrelling amongst ourselves like cats and dogs? Well, then, nothing is wrong with the growth of our population but everything is wrong with our thinking, planning and doing things.

Why should we enforce family planning by legislation or otherwise when other countries like Russia and China are not doing anything at all in this direction? Russia is most advanced scientifically and industrially, and that is why, she does not worry about her population; rather she is encouraging the growth of her population for expanding and strengthening her armed forces just as China is also doing the same with the same end in view. And why, in the face of such brilliant examples, India alone should try to curb the growth of her population by artificial means which is sacreligious to her religion, her customs and traditions?

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, do you want to live like paupers or beggars, or do you want to be a race of notorious criminals if you want merely "to increase and multiply" without providing for the barest necessities of life for the teeming millions? India is already a country of paupers, beggars and notorious criminals, and why? Because Indians are mostly poor, and also they are morally degraded; they are a race of idlers also; otherwise why should millions of able-bodied men and women should follow the trade of begging under the garb of religious mendicants, *sadhus*, *sanyasis*, *fakirs* etc.? It is only in India that the begging trade is tolerated and even encouraged by the educated and the uneducated people. In most of the western countries there are asylums for the crippled or disabled persons. These asylums are known as "work-houses" because every body is made to work according to his ability, and then, he or she is provided with food and cloth and medicine.

Then again, you allow every body in India—crippled or diseased—to marry and "to increase and multiply", and then, you preach sermons on birth-control! How inconsistent

and irrational we Indians are in our thinking and acting ! If I were the dictator of my country I would have banned all marriages of the crippled and the diseased, I would have destroyed root and branch the whole race of professional beggars, idlers and vagabonds, I would have also enforced family planning by legislation. If we took all these measures since we became politically independent there would have been no problem of food or population.

There may be various dogmas, commandments, injunctions in the Bible, the Quran, the Vedas and other scriptures of the world but they can not be applicable to all countries and to all times. What was quite proper, just and desirable in the days of Buddha or Christ or Mohammed can not be the same all over the world and in the present century. That is why, I say that the Commandment of 'increase and multiply' may be quite good and desirable even these days for America and Europe ; but surely, it is not applicable to India or China or any other country in the East or the West in the present century, if we have to consider the food problem as well as the population problem.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am in favour of "increase and multiply" atleast from one point of view. I hold the same view as China holds regarding the growth of population, namely, that manpower is the greatest power, and it will always be the deciding factor in the event of any kind of war between nations. Bertrand Russell has expressed his opinion in this connection also, namely, that in the event of any war between the East and the West, on any account, the overwhelming population of the East will simply swamp the population of the West, and no weapon of war would avail against such a vast and sweeping population ! If Bertrand Russell's words are likely to come true, as I personally believe, they will come true, would it not be the height of folly on our part to put a restraint on the Biblical commandment of "increase and multiply" or to force family planning by legislation ? In my opinion, neither U S A. nor U S S R. nor any other nation would ever dare to trigger a nuclear war for fear, first of all, of self-destruction ; and hence, if there be any conventional war in the near future the

tremendous man-power of both India and China will stand them in good stead particularly when they are not equipped like U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. with the latest arms and ammunition.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I can not agree with my preceding speaker or even with Bertrand Russell that mere man-power can be the deciding factor in a war. I am sure, the technique, the strategy, the type of weapons and missiles and also the total strength of the armed forces as well as other material resources will play an important role in all kinds of war. Hence, I would not like to attach so much importance to man-power only.

Then again, why should we always anticipate war? The world has been fearing a nuclear war for the last two decades but has it actually broken out? I think, all sensible nations are now realising the folly of the last two World Wars (of 1914 and 1939), and I am sure, they will never repeat the folly in any near future; and therefore, why should we encourage the growth of population and dig our own grave by inviting poverty and all sorts of misery. We can live much more comfortably and decently even with our present economy if we cut down each family by atleast fifty per cent. What is the good of multiplying the human race at random? Should we not try to produce a manly, strong and healthy race by cutting down our families? We can eat better food, live in better houses, spend more money on our education, and raise our standard of living in every possible way if we reduce the growth of population by artificial (*i.e.* by using contraceptives) or natural (*i.e.* by exercising self-restraint) means, whichever method is suitable or practicable. Our Government has already spent crores of rupees on popularising family planning but unfortunately, we Indians are so ignorant and superstitious that we fear the curses of Heaven or of our forefathers who have quitted the world by doing an act (*i.e.* birth-control) which is irreligious, sinful and even criminal because contraception means destruction of a prospective living generation of our successors as much as it is a violation of one of the most important laws of Nature—the biological law—which every living creature is bound to obey in order to preserve and propagate its species!

What a wonderful logic and also what a wonderful sense of morality and religion we Indians possess ! It is because of this wonderful sense of morality and religion that Indians have been left behind all the progressive countries in the World. Look at Japan, the most progressive country in the East ? Has she not put a check upon the growth of her population ? If she had multiplied her population like China she would have been long ago in the same hot soup as China is today. China has brains. It is Russia who wanted to give a little bit of her brains to China but China is so stiff-necked that she would not accept any body's advice for better or for worse ; and that is why, her stupidity is involving her into new calamities every new decade. I am sure, India will never follow the foot-steps of China.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	60	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	55	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	30	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„

REVIEW

The proposition is an interesting as well as an important problem of the day. Every body in the world is worrying about this particular problem and is trying to devise ways and means to solve it. But some of the countries are so obtuse that they will not listen to any sane advice. Most of the speakers have done well ; their arguments are quite logical and sound and interesting too.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board congratulates the speakers upon their performance in the present discussion which has been on the whole quite interesting. Let all the younger generations of our country think over this problem more seriously at home and find a way out.

Discussion No. 34

SHOULD BEGGARS AND SADHUS BE ENCOURAGED ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, beggars should be distinguished from *sadhus*, *fakirs* and *sanyasis* because the last three categories are known as mendicants or religious beggars. But are beggars religious ? Those who beg alms for the fund of some religious mission just as the monks of the Buddhist mission, the Rama Krishna mission, the Gaurya mission, the Christian mission, particularly the Roman Catholic mission collect funds for the maintenance or propagation of the various religious faiths in our country as well as in every other part of the world wherever the light of some religion has reached. And of the beggars there are two or three types e.g. able bodied professional beggars, crippled or disabled or diseased beggars who can not earn their living by doing any kind of work, and beggars who put on some religious garb and then, go a-begging. In our country, begging under some religious garb or plea goes on, and therefore, *sadhus*, *fakirs* and *sanyasis* are also professional beggars in the sense that whatever alms or funds they collect in the name of some religious mission is used by them for themselves, for their comfort and luxury and particularly for their indulgence in various kinds of vices such as smoking, drinking, gambling and even enjoying women. Ofcourse, all these acts are done behind the screen ; otherwise nobody would give these mendicants even one handful of rice or wheat. The mendicants of the various established religious missions such as the Roman Catholic mission, the Buddhist mission, the Rama Krishna mission etc. spend the collections of food or money or clothes or whatever people donate on the maintenance of the various

religious establishments which again are maintained for the propagation of the various religious faiths. Hence, begging in the name of some religious mission is not a bad thing ; as a matter of fact, many of the religious missions are doing a lot of social or humanitarian services to the needy, the shelterless, the diseased, the crippled souls of the world, and hence, such begging should be encouraged, provided it is not utilized also for political purposes as now-a-days many of the countries have been sending nothing but political propagandists as well as spies under the garb of religious missionaries, and such kinds of begging, in my opinion, must not be encouraged but must, on the other hand, be duly punished. As for the professional beggars in our country—particularly—the *sadhus*, *fakirs* and *sanyasis*—they must not be encouraged in any manner, because encouraging such beggars means encouraging crimes of idleness, vandalism, vagabondism and also vices of smoking (hemp, opium, *ganja* etc), drinking wine, gambling and enjoying women openly or secretly.

Then again, begging itself is a mean profession, and it is nowhere indulged as a profession except probably in India. Begging in England, as far as I know, is a crime, and as such, it is prosecuted. The beggars are also sent behind the bars as much as the thieves, burglars, swindlers, forgerers, robbers and other criminals are sent to imprisonment. Who actually can beg ? Either one who has been driven to the walls by adverse circumstances or one who is absolutely crippled or disabled in body and who can not earn his bread by doing any kind of work, or one who has no sense of self-respect, no sense of shame, or one who is a *pucca* hypocrite or cheat and wants to cheat the world by exploiting its charitable feelings, or one who is a confirmed idler and who is not prepared to earn his daily bread by the sweat of his brow. I am, ofcourse, not in favour of begging for any good or bad cause but I am surely in favour of helping the blind, the dumb, the deaf and all sorts of physical cripples who can not earn their living by any kind of work.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, like my preceding speaker I am also not in favour of begging but where will the disabled, crippled and diseased creature go ? Will they be allowed to starve before

our eyes when they are unable to earn their living by any means? Do you mean to say that Nature implanted the charitable feeling in us for nothing? What is the milk of human kindness for if it is not used for humanitarian purposes *i.e.* for helping the poor and the needy? All are not born equal in health or in brains or in strength or in beauty or in enduring hardship or in any of the faculties of the body or the mind; and hence, some kind of help is necessary for making up the deficiencies in others. To be poor or to be born crippled or diseased, or to be born deficient in brains does not lie with any body. It is Nature who distributes all these qualities—proficiencies or deficiencies—to all human beings with uneven hands; and hence, it is necessary for man to make up the deficiencies wherever it is necessary.

All the great founders of religion, all the noble souls in every part of the world have recommended charity but not to abuse it. One should help only those who badly need help of any kind; ofcourse, one should very carefully scrutinize the cases that need public charity; otherwise abuse of charity would be an encouragement to crimes and vices as in India it has been happening from times immemorial. We have been encouraging begging of all kinds on any pretext—noble or mean, honest or dishonest; otherwise how could so many millions of able-bodied beggars in the garb of *sadhus*, *sanyasis*, *fakirs*, monks etc. could come into existence? Most of us believe in charity in order to wash away our sins *i.e.* we believe that if we help a beggar with food or cloth or money, all our sins are forgiven by God and we go straight to heaven! That is why, many of us do not turn away any beggar from our door; that is why, we donate big or small amounts of money for building some temple or mosque or church or orphanage or *dharamsala* or dispensary or hospital or some such charitable establishment or institution. The donors of charity possibly do not know how their charity or how these charitable establishments or institutions are abused by those who are placed in charge of the management of these charitable concerns. Ofcourse, I am not at all in favour of this kind of charity which is based on pure selfishness either for purposes of self-glorification or of expiation of one's sins. I am in favour of charity to the really needy and the crippled; the best

way of helping them is to build asylums or work-houses in our country as they have done in England and in many other parts of Europe and America. It is really a pity that charity also has become now-a-days a mask of hypocrisy.

Third Speaker

But, gentlemen, who is really responsible for the poverty or the various kinds of misery of mankind? Is it Nature or man? Most people would blame Nature; but I would blame man entirely. If a crippled or diseased man or woman does not marry, there can be no diseased or crippled issue of such parents. Then again, if man takes every care of his health, he can not possibly become so badly diseased or disabled as not to be able to earn his living by any kind of work. The greatest human ill is poverty which has been brought about by man himself and not by Nature at all or by God or by Fate as we superstitious and ignorant people mostly believe. The economic distress of people in general is chiefly due to wrong planning and mal-administration. So far our own country is concerned, we should not have undertaken so many development projects all at once, we should not have neglected our agriculture at all, we should not have spent so much money on the expansion of our armed forces, we should not have made any devaluation of our Rupee for the second time when we had already paid heavy penalties once in 1949 by committing the same blunder, we should have dealt with the black-marketers with an iron hand, we should not have allowed the hordes of essential goods to go scott-free like this as we have been doing ever since our Independence. Some of our big officials including the ministers of certain portfolios were involved in corruption but did we take any steps against them? Did we take any steps against some of the big business magnates who corrupted officials? If we did not, why should we blame the poorer section of our population for their poverty and miseries for which we alone, and not Nature or God or Fate, are really responsible?

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, all that has been so far argued in favour of charity or rather in favour of the beggars, *sadhus*, fakirs and others is absolutely wrong from my point of view because I

honestly believe that both Nature and man are equally responsible for our poverty and misery. If Nature is responsible we can correct Nature's ways with the help of science as we have been doing by freeing the diseased from the various physical maladies and also by making able-bodied many of the disabled persons by means of our medical and surgical knowledge and skill both of which we lacked before the advent of science. We can fertilize some of our sterile lands, we can make a more scientific irrigation work and thereby we can improve our agriculture considerably. It is food the first essential for human existence which has to be produced sufficiently in order to feed the hungry millions of our country ; and then, we will have to provide them with cloth, and last of all, with some kind of shelter for all against sun and rain. If we can provide for these three great essentials, others we may or may not provide at all, and yet nobody is going to blame us if some people complain (as they will always complain) that they are not getting some of the common amenities of modern life. Let all such amenities go to hell ; we want to have only the most essential things and nothing else, and if we can provide these most essential things for all, nobody is going to blame us for our wrong planning, for our mal-administration or for our corruption.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am raising a new question before you all, namely, if you do not encourage the beggars—the *sadhus*, the *fakirs*, the *sanyasis* or the monks—should we destroy them all ? If we put them behind the bars, we will have to feed them which means again unnecessary expenses on their account and a fresh burden on our national economy. Can we afford to destroy the whole race of beggars by drowning them into the Indian Ocean ? There will be a great revolt against such a wholesale massacre ! The only thing we can possibly do is to condemn them to hard work and make them earn their living by work and not by idleness.

But that is only one way of escape from the problem. But how would you tackle those religious mendicants who professedly have renounced human society or worldly life and have taken to the life of a *fakir* or a *sanyasi* ? What right

have you to force them to come back to the towns and cities and condemn them to manual work when they have decided to devote the rest of their life to the contemplation of God ? Would it not be a great sin on your part to force the spiritualists to become materialists again ?

So, you see, the problem of beggars or religious mendicants in India is not such an easy problem as many of my friends have taken it to be. I for myself am a believer in co-existence. As the good and the evil are co-existing side by side in this world, why should not the beggars co-exist with those who are charitable at heart and who want to help the needy, the crippled, the diseased ? In my opinion, let all kinds of beggars—professional or otherwise, religious mendicants or others—exist in this world ; and if Nature does not want to perpetuate their race, she will contrive some means or other to weed them out as Nature often reduces the population of the world by producing some armed conflicts in some parts of the world or by sending the epidemics of some devastating diseases like plague, pox and cholera at certain intervals

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, the fifth speaker and one or two other speakers have given an evasive answer but no solution to the problem. They have not probably the courage to say that we must ban all systems of begging and do away with the beggars, once for all. Or probably they are too soft hearted to dismiss the beggars altogether from their view. May I, therefore, suggest a correct solution to the problem ? In one word, I would say, better destroy the beggars including the religious mendicants just as you would do with the vermin and the pestilences—the rats and the mice, the locusts and other insects that destroy our food—our vegetable and cornfields or granaries ! Let us forget, for a while, our softness of hearts, our charitable feelings, our philanthropy, our humanitarianism. If we can carry on destructive campaigns against mosquitoes and bugs, why not do the same in the case of the beggars too ? Let there be peace on earth as well as in heaven !

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	65	out	of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	65	„	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	40	„	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	45	„	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	50	„	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	40	„	„	„	„

REVIEW

Two of the speakers have done very well, while the rest have not done badly. On the whole, the discussion has been quite interesting, probably because the proposition itself is rather unusual, if not interesting. In no other part of the world than in India, such a question could be raised.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has nothing to comment in the case of such a topic for discussion except that in spite of the peculiarity of the proposition, the speakers have done fairly well; their arguments, though based on nothing, are quite forcible and convincing!

Discussion No. 35

IS A PRETTY WIFE A BLESSING OR A CURSE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, honestly speaking, who would like to have an ugly wife whether a pretty wife is a blessing or a curse ? Why do people marry ? Both man and woman marry for bodily enjoyments, particularly, for sex enjoyments whatever else they may have to say about the aim or purpose of human marriage. Most people hypocritically say that there is a difference between human marriage and animal mating, namely that human beings marry for procreation, for building up the family, for enlarging human society, and for establishing human glories through golden deeds, while animals mate merely for satisfying the bodily passion as much as for perpetuating the species, which is one of the biological laws. That is why probably, when men were in the stage of animals, they were asked by Jesus Christ "to increase and multiply". But in my opinion, there is no other aim or motive or purpose behind human marriage than the fulfilment of the animal passion, the maintenance or propagation of the human species, and no other nobler aim although man may after his birth on earth may achieve various kinds of glory and fame which may be regarded by some of us as the nobler aim of human life or the nobler purpose of human marriage.

Nevertheless, gentlemen, in my eyes, there is no difference between human marriage and mating of the animals. In such a case, how can one like the idea of marrying an ugly wife ? In what ways can such a wife contribute to man's happiness ? It is the body, the flesh, the complexion, the shape, the form,

the contour of the limbs, the refined features, the curly locks of hair, the lithe and delicate frame of the wife which a man enjoys and straight goes to heaven while enjoying her. Some of you might say that in darkness there is no difference between an ugly wife and a pretty wife. That may be true but who enjoys his wife in darkness or even covered? Who enjoys only the sex act? Who enjoys merely the voice, the talks, the behaviour, the accomplishments or even the virtues of a wife? Every body wants to enjoy her body first and then to appreciate all other qualities in her.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker has given quite a different turn to the problem before us. Instead of answering the question straight he has side-tracked it probably because (excuse me) he is an extremely passionate person just like a beast (pardon me please). The aim of human marriage is definitely not the same as has been described by him: but it is much nobler than the mere satisfaction of the bodily desire. Any how, a pretty wife is not at all a blessing for the following :—

1. Shakespeare has most truly said, 'Beauty draws the robber much readier than gold'.

2. Every body has an eye on a pretty woman just as every thief or robber has got an eye on silver and gold only, and not on brass, iron or copper or on any other baser metal

3. A pretty woman is always self-conscious or rather conscious of her beauty, and that is why, she wants to maintain her beauty at any cost by putting on costly cosmetics, fine garments and even ornaments although she needs none of these to add to her natural beauty

4. A pretty woman wants to be surrounded by beautiful things, and that is why, she wants to have attractive furniture, attractive tapestries, curtains, decoration pieces and everything else attractive in her house so that she may reign as the 'beauty queen' among all beautiful things.

5. It is said that pretty women have little power of self-control particularly when they are flattered. If any body says

to a young woman that she is pretty, she atonce becomes a slave. Naturally, when every body flatters a pretty woman, she becomes every body's sweet-heart which is indeed a misfortune or rather a calamity for a husband

6. A pretty woman is mostly found to be proud, haughty and even insolent, and that is why, she is not so obedient or docile to the husband. She thinks that she can make a slave of her husband by her beauty alone—the beauty of her limbs and not of her soul !

7. A pretty woman is useless as a house wife because she is constantly busy consulting the mirror and using all sorts of beauty products in order to look more pretty than she already is !

8. The poor husband of a pretty wife has, therefore, to do his office work, to attend all sorts of outdoor work and also to look after the household !

9. However educated, strong or courageous a pretty woman may be, it is dangerous for her to travel alone (i.e. without an escort) because at every step she is likely to be kidnapped by the “beauty-thieves” ! You can not even take out your pretty wife to parties, to picture-houses, to restaurants, to coffee houses, to clubs or to any other public place because every body will pursue her like a blood hound ! It is, therefore, difficult to protect a pretty wife.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, whatever the first speaker has said about a pretty woman is all wrong. I will give you other arguments in favour of a pretty woman so that you may be thoroughly convinced that a pretty wife is not at all a curse but a positive blessing :—

1. If your pretty wife is highly educated also, you can get her employed on a high salary as a private secretary to some big business magnate, which means, she will be a great asset to your family.

2. A pretty wife can serve you as an easy passport to high circles ; and who does not like to be introduced to high or aristocratic circles ?

3. A pretty wife is far less expensive than an ugly wife because a pretty wife requires no artificial decorations such as costly cosmetics, costly garments, costly jewelleries in order to beautify her further, whereas an ugly wife in order to be presentable to society would require all kinds of artificial decoration which are an expensive affair. A poor husband can not afford to waste so much money on the wife alone because he has to spend money on many other essential items.

4. It is absolutely wrong to think that a pretty woman always consults the mirror and is engaged mostly in beautifying herself. On the other hand, an ugly woman actually consults the mirror one hundred times a day and is constantly busy beautifying herself out of her natural fear lest she would not be noticed by her husband who may approach other more attractive women for his consolation !

5. It is absolutely wrong to think that a pretty woman falls an easy prey to temptations. A pretty woman is conscious of her superiority, and hence, she does not yield easily to any and every man, while an ugly woman, if she finds that some body is after her, she feels flattered and readily yields to him partly because she is neglected by her own husband, and chiefly because she wants to have the largest number of admirers to show to the world or rather particularly to the pretty women that she is also no less in demand than they !

6. An ugly woman is more fond of displaying herself in public than a pretty woman, and that is why, she wants to accompany her husband everywhere—to the picture houses, to the restaurants or coffee houses or even to the clubs. An ugly woman is comparatively far more suspicious than a pretty woman. She thinks that if she does not go out with her husband everywhere, he may be tempted by any pretty woman, and that is why, she becomes a constant source of irritation to her husband who does not like to parade his ugly wife before public eyes !

7. An ugly woman even if she is highly educated or accomplished, can not possibly secure any good job in order to be finally helpful to her husband. Nobody, ordinarily speaking, wants to engage an ugly woman as a private secretary or a

typist or even as a shop-assistant because customers can not be attracted by ugly 'show girls' ! Every office boss wants to have a pretty young woman for his assistant particularly when he has an ugly wife at home ! Hence, ugly women are in demand nowhere except possibly in Africa !

8. If you believe in the law of polarity, and not in Shakespeare's words that beauty draws the robber quicker than gold, you must also believe that your ugly wife can elope with any and every body, particularly with the domestic menials ; but a 'beauty queen' is an aristocrat ; she will elope only with kings and princes !

9. If you marry a pretty wife, you will have beautiful children, particularly, beautiful daughters who will sell readily in the marriage market, while the ugly daughters will have to be disposed off with a heavy dowry ! Would you still prefer on ugly wife ?

10. A pretty wife can never be divorced or neglected by her husband unless he is positively demoralised because a pretty wife is a constant source of romance and inspiration to him whether he is an office clerk or a school master or a scientist or a writer.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, can you explain to me why a tall man prefers a short wife, a lean and thin man prefers a plump wife, an illiterate man wants to marry a highly educated wife, a richman wants to have a poor woman as his partner in life, an ugly woman wants to have an attractive husband while a handsome young man wants to have an ugly girl for his wife ? People say, two of a trade seldom agree, which means in other words, a handsome husband is not agreeable to a pretty wife and *vice versa*. But why ? I will answer the question for you. This universe is a universe of opposite qualities which attract one another by virtue of the law of polarity without which the universe would have gone to pieces. The weak have an adoration for the strong ; the disabled and the crippled have an admiration for the able-bodied ; the illiterate worship the learned, the poor adore the rich, the weak envy the strong ; and hence, a pretty wife is a blessing for the ugly husband

while a handsome husband is a blessing for the ugly wife ! There is something romantic or enchanting about ugliness otherwise the white races would not have gone mad after the dark races. Don't you find many of the Western husbands having Eastern wives or many of the Eastern husbands having Western wives ? What is the psychology behind it ? The same law of polarity—which explains everywhere the attraction of the negative pole for the positive pole !

An ugly wife, in my opinion, is an asset to the husband, because she works in the kitchen, she cleanses the utensils, she scrubs the floor, she washes the clothes, and she attends her husband too in the night, ofcourse, in darkness because in darkness there is no difference between an ugly wife and a pretty wife ! An ugly wife cannot be made uglier in her skin or complexion by pox or by any other skin disease, whereas a "beauty queen" can be made most repulsive in a moment by any of such diseases. A beautiful garment requires a good wardrobe in order to preseve its glossiness but a home-spun *khaddar* can be hung up even on the wall without the risk of being soiled. A pretty wife, accordingly has to be handled very tenderly ; otherwise her petals, like those of the rose, will readily sicken or fall off ; but an ugly wife can be handled any way one likes, and yet she will not be easily tarnished— that is her supreme quality. Hence, I am not for a pretty wife at all.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, it seems, my preceding speaker is not an artist, he has no sense of beauty ; otherwise how can he prefer an ugly wife to a pretty wife ? Honestly speaking, do you feel inspired or even happy when your ugly wife is sitting by your side or when she is moving about everywhere in your house like a ghost in darkness ? If you happen to be an artist or a writer, I am afraid, you will run away twenty miles from such a wife ; and yet my preceding speaker says that an ugly wife is an asset to the family while a pretty wife is a curse ! Keats has said, beauty is truth, and truth is beauty, and a thing of beauty is a joy for ever. Do you mean to say that such a great poet has told us a downright lie ?

I am afraid, my preceding speaker has explained the law

of polarity in a wrong manner. An ugly woman may be attracted by a handsome man, and an ugly man may also be equally attracted by a pretty woman ; but have you ever heard of a single instance in the world in which a handsome person (man or woman) has been attracted by an ugly person (man or woman) ? The weak certainly envy the strong just as the poor equally envy the rich, and why ? Because the weak have no strength in them ; because the poor have no wealth in their possession. Similarly, the ugly envy the handsome because the ugly have no beauty, no attraction. The law of polarity works only one way atleast in human nature but may not do in external nature where the opposites attract each other both ways

But the law of polarity can not be the crowning argument for choosing an ugly wife. It may hold good in the case of inanimate objects but surely not in the case of living and self-conscious beings in whom the mind and the heart play an important role. The body may be satisfied with mere flesh whether it is ugly or beautiful ; but the mind prefers the rainbow and the butterfly because of their enchanting colours. Hence, everybody would like to marry a pretty wife.

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, if it is a fact that every rose has its thorn or that every flower has its canker (a destructive insect), what is the guarantee that a pretty wife has not many thorns and many cankers in her ? Many great thinkers have said that beauty is only skin-deep, and below that skin there is nothing but blood, puss, urine, excreta ! So, there is no difference between a pretty woman and an ugly woman except on their skin. Is it not foolish to be led away by merely the skin ?

If the wife is ugly and the husband is handsome, so much the better for the husband because the wife will constantly dote on him, constantly take care of him, and constantly will try to please him ; or in other words, she will be far more devoted to him than a pretty wife because a pretty wife is conscious of her beauty, and hence, confident about her hold on her husband ; she is, therefore, very likely to neglect him or overlook him, or refuse to give him constant company, or she

may even be less devoted to him. Would you, gentlemen, like to have such a pretty wife to serve as a mere decoration-piece in your house? I would surely want to have a wife who would attend me in the sick-bed, who will look after me as well as after my children and home so that I can be free of some of the household responsibilities. I am not prepared to have a wife—a Cleopatra or a Hellen—who is not serviceable to me any way except to my poetic or artistic mind; but I am neither a poet nor an artist, and as such I do not believe in beauty which is of no use to me except as an exhibit in a show case which too would run the risk of being stolen any moment by the thieves and burglars!

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	70	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Sixth Speaker	„	40	„	„	„

REVIEW

Most of the speakers have done well probably because the proposition is quite interesting and catching to the imagination of the young minds. If there were women contestants, the discussion would have been far more interesting provided the proposition had been reversed *i.e.* converted into “Is a handsome husband a blessing or a curse?”

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board notices much of humour in some of the speakers which is a good sign for the would-be officers of the Armed Forces. Some of the arguments of the speakers are psychologically interesting;—they are not merely cut-and-dried bones!

Discussion No. 36

IS NATIONAL INTEGRATION POSSIBLE IN INDIA ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, why should not national integration be possible in India ? It is already an accomplished fact, and there cannot be any question about it. If there can be national integration in the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. both of which countries consist of so many races, so many religions, so many languages just as in India, why can there not be national integration in our country inspite of all the heterogeneous elements ? Even during the rule of Asoka and Akbar India was full of such varied races, languages and religions yet we know Akbar and Asoka succeeded in bringing about national unity in India. Similarly, Pandit Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi too like two magicians by their magic as it were thoroughly succeeded in integrating five hundred million souls into one nation, into one race, into one religion, and into one language as it were although in our country everybody follows his own religion, his own mother tongue, his own community or sect. Mahatma Gandhi fought for sixty years of his life, while Pandit fought atleast for twenty years of his rule in order to bring about national integration ; and although some people say that India has been partitioned on the communal basis yet I say that there is no communalism, no sectarianism, no racialism, no linguism in our country now because Gandhi and Nehru have been adopting and following very closely the policy of secularism which is the chief factor in the national integration of our country. It is Pakistan very often who has been doing much of propaganda through the radio and other means of communication against India, and

that is why some of the foreigners may be misled by that propaganda which says that in India there is rank communalism, bitter racialism, acute sectarianism, fanatic linguism but which in fact is a downright lie and which is propagated by Pakistan in order to foment some kind of bad blood between the Hindus and the Muslims in India. There is absolutely no ill-feeling between the Hindus and the Muslims in India. It was clearly proved in 1965 when Pakistan made an unprovoked aggression upon Jammu and Kashmir and when she (Pakistan) tried her utmost to incite the Indian Muslims to fight against the Indian Hindus, all her malicious attempts failed because the Muslims and the Hindus behaved just like brothers because both acknowledged India as their own mother country which both of them defended against the treacherous aggression of Pakistan with all their might. Then again, from time to time, when the Pakistan Government tries to pump out the Hindu community from East Pakistan by getting the Hindus looted and raped by the Muslims, the Hindus in India never get agitated in their mind or try to retaliate the wrong on the innocent Muslims of India. All these things go to prove clearly that national integration of India is an accomplished fact.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, national integration may be our noble aim, secularism may be our pious doctrine, coexistence may be our generous maxim, but how can my preceding speaker say that national integration is an accomplished fact in the very face of so many obstacles which are still persisting? India is such a vast country or rather a sub-continent with a population of more than five hundred millions, speaking so many languages, following so many religions, belonging to so many races, communities or sects, and observing so many castes, and above all, there are so many autonomous States as they have in America or in Russia. We have got in India Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Parsees, Anglo-Indians, Eurasians, Buddhists, Jains, Christians scattered all over the various States of our great sub-continent. Most of these races, sects or communities have different views, notions, attitudes, ideologies in matters of religion, language, education, culture, politics, practically in

every sphere of thought and activity. Even the various States are independent of one another, and consequently, there is often much of differences between them in certain vital issues or problems. It is, therefore, not an easy job to bring about or maintain national integration in the face of such a heterogeneous mixture of men and things. India during the British rule used to be constantly torn between the Hindus and the Muslims; and even after Independence She has been torn several times by her communal and linguistic problems. The ugliest feature about the Hindu community is its problem of untouchability which has actually separated quite a good lot of our population from the other section which consists of the superior castes such as the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas who in the eyes of the depressed classes or the untouchables are foul tyrants, dictators and exploiters just as the Britishers were to the Indians. Religion is a very delicate thing about which even the most highly educated people are acutely sensitive, not to speak of the illiterate or the half-educated section of the population. Even in the matter of language, everybody seems to be quite orthodox or conservative. We have been watching for the last two decades how even the Hindus have been bitterly fighting among themselves ever since Hindi has been declared as the national language of India. Sometimes, even the various States of our Republic quarrel with one another whenever there is any question of a special award in finance, food, technical education etc. in favour of any particular State.

Gentlemen, the Britishers, so long they ruled over India, always tried to foment all sorts of enmity, strife, hatred, misunderstanding among the people by creating communal riots, by setting one sect against another, and even by showing all sorts of favouritism and nepotism to certain sections of the population so that there could be no unity or peace or harmony in the country. "Divide and rule" was their cardinal principle or policy behind their method of administration. When they quitted India, they left behind them so many Native States that would have produced a mighty conflagration in our country had not the wisdom of Nehru and Patel tackled the problem very cautiously and successfully.

Gentlemen, it was for national integration that Mahatma

Gandhi wanted some Indian language to be the national language of our country so that through this common language, the various races, sects, communities and even the various States of India could communicate with one another and thereby have a proper understanding without which no mutual co-operation is possible. Neither Mahatma Gandhi nor Pandit Nehru wanted any foreign language to be the national language or even the common language or the *lingua franca* of our country. They discovered that Hindi is spoken and understood very widely all over India except in the Southern States where the native languages are Tamil, Telegu, Malayalam, and Kanarese. South India alone protested heavily against the acknowledgement of Hindi as the link language of India. This protest led to much of agitation throughout the Southern parts of our sub-continent with the result that Nehru declared with the approval of the Parliament that English also should remain as the associate language of our country till the non-Hindi-speaking States are able to pick up the Hindi language. Language is indeed the greatest means of bringing about a proper understanding between countries, races, and nations of the world, and it is through the medium of a common language that the human race can probably come to some kind of world unity or world harmony. That is why, Pandit Nehru recommended the cultivation of Hindi for international understanding and harmony, and the learning of the English language, which is the most widely spoken or understood language in the world, for the purpose of international understanding, co-operation and peace.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I fully support the view of the second speaker, and I want to add a few more points to his arguments in order to strengthen his position. Pandit Nehru considered religion at the greatest obstacle in the way of national integration. The Britishers knew this quite well, and that is why, they always inflamed the religious question of the two major communities in our country by instigating the Muslims to slaughter cows before Hindu temples, and inciting the Hindus to have music before mosques at the time of prayer. The Britishers also tried to create a split between the Shia Muslims and the Sunni

Muslims in order further to sub-divide our country. They always helped to infuse into our population all sorts of sectarian and communal prejudice, hatred and enmity, as the result of which there was always some kind of disruption, disunion and chaos in our country during the British rule. Both Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru considered the question of religion as the most delicate problem which they tackled very cautiously by insisting on religious toleration and by declaring our country as a Secular State. Even then sometimes, some of the orthodox religious fanatics of our country try to raise the religious question and produce political disturbances, particularly, between the two major communities—the Hindus and the Muslims. That is why, Pandit Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi had been very particular about religious toleration, secularism and all possible means of liberalising the common mind on the religious question. But we Hindus or Muslims are so orthodox about our religious faiths or views or sentiment that we often insist on attaching some Muslim or Hindu name to our educational institutions such as Aligarh Muslim University, Banaras Hindu University, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College or School, Kshatrya College or School. Even the Christian Community in our country is no less orthodox than the Hindu or the Muslim Community because we find so many educational institutions in our country named after certain Christian saints such as St. Paul's College, St. Francis School, Loreto Convent School etc. The Muslim community loves to brand their educational institutions with the name of "Islamia" School or College or University. Then again, each of the communities in India, whether Hindu or Muslim or Christian, invariably tries to have its own religious teachings in the various educational institutions although no educational institution in our country holds exclusively, on its roll, students or teachers professing one religion only, either Hinduism, Islam or Christianity. Naturally, when the Bible, the Quran or the Gita is being taught in the classes, some, of the orthodox students or teachers may object to such kinds of religious instructions against their respective individual religious faith, and may create some kind of sectarian or communal feeling among themselves, which surely helps to contribute to our national disintegration. Mahatma Gandhi was an orthodox Hindu while Pandit Nehru was a believer in every kind of

religion, although he was born in a Hindu family and brought up in a Christian atmosphere in England. Gandhi was also greatly influenced by the Bible and the Quran, and that is why, he used to equate Allah with Rama, and Jesus Christ with any of the Hindu Gods. Then again, formerly (if not now-a-days) we used to notice that hotels, restaurants, boarding-houses or other public rest houses or eating-places used to be classified under sectarian or communal names. For example, the orthodox Hindus would never drink water from the Muslim hydrants or take tea or eat anything at any Muslim stall or restaurant or hotel. Ofcourse, there is no such restriction in eating or drinking among the Muslims and the Christians; but then, unfortunately, two or three decades ago, the Muslims were not permitted to eat or lodge in any of the Hindu restaurants or hotels. The Britishers most mischievously used to have separate Hindu and Muslim hydrants, tea-stalls and eating-places at every railway station of our country. But now-a-days, due to years of strenuous efforts on the part of Gandhi and Nehru much of the religious orthodoxy or communal or sectarian fanaticism has died away; and that is why, after the political independence of India, we have learnt to be far more liberal than we ever were during the British rule in India. Ofcourse, science and industries and international contact and communication are mainly responsible for the liberalisation of our religious views and thoughts, prejudices and fanaticisms.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, you have listened to the previous two speakers and you have seen how they have pointed out the various obstacles in the way of our national integration but at the same time how indirectly proved that national integration has been already accomplished inspite of the various obstacles. I would not, therefore, say merely at this stage that national integration is not only possible but it has actually been realised because otherwise there could not have been such a peaceful administration in our country for the last two decades. Do you find any communal disturbance anywhere in India? Do you find any agitation in the South over the language issue? Do you find any untouchability in our country? Do you find any rivalry between the States? Do you find these days any

hydrant or tea-stall or any hotel or restaurant exclusively meant for either the Hindus or the Muslims or the Christians or the Parsees or the Sikhs ? Do you find any nepotism or favouritism in the services—civil or military or Police in any of the States of our Republic ? Did you not notice in last General Elections how the various communities voted for one another, and that is why, in some of the States, non-Congress government could be formed. All these are signs of unity and integration. Don't you find so many Muslims in the key-positions of our administration ? Did not you notice how many of Muslim soldiers and officers of our Armed Forces sacrificed their lives on behalf of India while fighting against Pakistan in 1965 ? There are still a few major States in our country where the Muslim community is a major community, and yet the Hindus have never been found to hesitate to extend their co-operation to the Muslim brothers. If this is not a positive proof of our national integration, I do not know what other proof you would demand. In my opinion, we have already attained perfect integration of all communities, sects, races, religions and languages.

Fifth Speaker

But, gentlemen, if you do not mind my disagreement with some of my preceding speakers. I want to quote verse and chapter in order to show that we are yet furthest away from national integration. What have you to say in reply to the demand of the Akalis for a Panjabi *Suba* ? Have you been able to solve the problem of the Nagas ? How would you explain the communal repercussions in India whenever the Muslims happen to massacre the Hindus in East Pakistan ? How do you say that the language issue is over ? Is there any guarantee that the problem will not crop up again ? What name would you put on the constant tussle which is going on among the various political parties of our country ? How would you explain away when you find so many Congressmen quitting the Indian National Congress ? Does it mean any kind of national integration or national dis-integration ? How do you explain the formation of non Congress government in some of the States after the last General Elections ? I refuse to believe that the problem of untouchability does not any longer exist. Just send some member of the scheduled caste

into the kitchen of a Brahmin in any part of India and see what actually happens as the reaction of it ! Just go to South India, particularly, in the rural areas; go also to the villages of Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, and see for yourselves how the depressed or the scheduled castes are treated by the superior castes. It is only in the big towns and cities that you will find no untouchability prevailing ; you can even find in such towns as Bombay, Delhi, Calcutta, Madras certain cases of even intercaste marriages between the scheduled castes and the superior castes, chiefly because some of the young members of scheduled castes have been recruited to the Indian Administrative Service or to other Central Services. It is only in the Armed Forces that you will find no untouchability, no communalism, no sectarianism, no linguism, no casteism, no nepotism or favouritism.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	65	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	70	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	75	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	50	„	„	„

REVIEW

Some of the speakers, especially, the first four speakers have done exceptionally well ; it is only the last speaker who has flagged down slightly. Some of the arguments and illustrations of the speakers are indeed irrefutable. It is striking that majority of the speakers have directly or indirectly proved our success in the achievement of national integration.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The speakers really deserve congratulations for their admirable success in the discussion of one of the most important topics of our country. It is gratifying that all of them are equally well-informed in the subject of the discussion.

Discussion No. 37

SHOULD WE BE ATHEISTS OR SCEPTISTS OR NIHILISTS ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, let us, first of all, try to understand what an atheist is or what a sceptist is or what a nihilist is. An atheist is a disbeliever in God ; a sceptist is one who questions the possibility of knowledge or a person who questions the truth of the religious doctrines ; a nihilist is one who rejects all religious and moral principles or one who believes in nothing or believes that nothing has any real existence.

Do you want me, gentlemen, to say which I would personally prefer—atheism, scepticism or nihilism ? I would prefer to be an atheist rather than a sceptist or a nihilist. One can afford to be an atheist because it matters little to oneself or to others or even to God if one does not believe in God. Then again, nobody has seen God ; no body has got any idea of God, and yet most people believe in God out of fear. But I do not like to suffer from that fear complex which is actually the root cause of the invention of God. The philosophers, the founders of religion—all have described their own conception of God although none of them has seen God ; and herein lies the whole fun of believing in God. I want to know from you, gentlemen, how we can be inclined to believe in a thing which we have never seen, which we cannot perceive with any of our senses, and which probably does not exist at all. Do you think, it would matter in the least to God (if there be any God at all) if people do not believe in God or even if they believe in Him ? Would it matter any way to us even if we do not believe in God, if we do not pray to God, or even if we abuse

God ? In my opinion, it would not matter to us in the least either way because God does not exist at all. Have you not seen in innumerable cases how people can not save themselves from a calamity, how they starve, suffer and even die inspite of all their prayers to God, and how again they succeed, prosper and enjoy their life although they do not care to think of God even for a moment ?

In my opinion, gentlemen, all human beings have been labouring under an illusion, when from the very dawn of the human race, they have been believing in God and also have been worshipping Him in various ways and in various places of worship—the church, the temple and the mosque. Some stupid people argue that because all people believe in God, so God must exist. Well, in reply I would simply put a counter question, “Do ghosts and apparitions, angels and devils also exist because so many people believe in them ?” Gentlemen, it is not I alone but there are many people all over the world who do not believe in God at all, and who are nonetheless happy on that account.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, may I ask my preceding speaker one question only, namely, if there be no God, who has created this universe, these countless stars, the sun and the moon, who has brought into existence the myriads of living and non-living things on the surface of the earth ? Does he mean to say that all these came out of nothing ? But how can there be anything without any cause ? The human mind cannot conceive of such an absurdity. You may not believe in God as a human being or as an animal or as a reptile or even as trees, rocks, rivers, oceans etc. You can believe, if you like, in the universe itself as God, as some people believe that God is everywhere, that God is in every living and non-living thing.

I am sure, God is not a mere speculation or a mere figment of the human brain. If it were so, so many great thinkers would not have devoted all their life to the contemplation of God, either at home or in the jungles or in the mountain caves. Do you think, Jesus Christ, Gautam Buddha, Mohammad, Guru Nanak and other great founders of the various religions

were all blind people? Certainly not. They must have discovered something—some light which convinced them that there is God, that there is some creator of this universe. If there is really no God, how is it that man constantly feels that he is being protected, governed, and even guided at every step of his life's career on earth? Do you think that this universe is a mere dream or an illusion? Or do you believe that you also *i.e.* your *ego* also does not exist or that nothing exists? We can not, however, conceive of such an impossible or absurd thing. Do you think, something is wrong with our mind, or that God is something which is beyond the perception of the five senses with which our body is endowed? What are these senses? What is this body? What is this mind? Everything gets confused when we raise such questions; and therefore, we have to believe in something atleast, call it God or Brahma or Creator or by any other name; and if we do not believe in any such thing, we will go mad, as many people have gone mad by being atheists or disbelievers in God!

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I claim to be a sceptic and not a disbeliever or a believer in God. Somehow or other I cannot rely upon human understanding, human brains, human reason, human judgment or human anything. When I go to analyse the so-called truths which the scientists and the philosophers are said to have discovered, I find that they are all, in my eyes, nothing but erroneous views or notions or thoughts or feelings or conceptions. How can you certify the reality of the soul or that it is immortal or that it migrates from one body to another? How can you have any correct idea about the reality of matter? Do you think, the shape, the form, the colour of things are exactly what we perceive with our senses or that they vary with the individual observers and from different angles? It is a fact that matter sometimes takes the shape of a solid, sometimes the form of a liquid, while at other times, it changes into a gas; and then ultimately it disappears from our view. Does it really disappear from the world? When a man dies, does his soul disappear into the thin air or into nothing? Why should we say that the soul is born again and again? What is the positive proof of it? There is no proof or guarantee, and yet we believe in the

immortality of the soul and also in its transmigration. All these questions about life and death, matter and spirit, are perfectly pertinent ; but we cannot give any satisfactory answer to any of the questions. That is why, I am a sceptic. Probably, scepticism like blind faith is inherent in the human mind, and that is why, some people readily believe in everything whereas other people doubt, hesitate or refuse to believe in anything. Those who doubt or hesitate to believe in anything unless they get some positive proof about its reality or truth are known as sceptics just as I am. My opposite kind would be dogmatist who believes in everything whether he gets any proof of it or not. But I am not a dogmatist because I am not sure of anything, because I am not sure of God or of myself or even of this universe which I am perceiving with all my senses.

I should tell you, gentlemen, that it is far better to be a sceptic rather than to be a blind dogmatist ; because if you are not a sceptic, you will some day pick up a poisonous snake taking it to be a piece of rope, or you will sometimes embrace a tree fancying it to be your young wife, or you will some day swallow poison taking it to be a food ! Hence, in my opinion, it is better to be a sceptic than to be a dogmatist. It is only the blind, ignorant and superstitious fools who are dogmatists while it is the wise, the learned, the intelligent persons who are sceptics. Have you not seen how even some of the scientific theories have changed. Formerly, the earth used to be considered as the centre of the universe, and the sun used to be considered as revolving round the earth ; but now quite a reverse theory is being followed, namely, that the earth revolves round the sun, and that the earth is not the centre of the universe. Who knows that in future two and two will not make four or that fire will not consume things or that water will not quench thirst or that things will not gravitate to one another. That is why, I am not prepared to believe in anything unless it is proved to be true.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, my immediately preceding speaker claims to be a sceptic. He can please himself by being anything that he likes. But he must be feeling, at the same time, what agonies of doubt, suspense, uncertainty, hesitation he has to

go through all his life, and yet he would find no peace ! It is better to believe in every thing than to believe in nothing ! How can you work or do any thing if you constantly have doubt in your mind like Hamlet of Shakespeare, and say within yourself, "Should I go to college or not, should I eat or not, should I bathe or not, should I tell a lie or not etc. ?" You must have to be sure of something on which you will have to stand and begin your struggle for existence whether you succeed or fail in the struggle. No science, no philosophy, no trade, no commerce could proceed a single step if certain things were not taken for granted. If you do not take for granted. If you do not take for granted that two and two make four or that every solid gravitates or that fire will consume if you put your finger in it or water will quench your thirst, how any of the sciences or mathematics or physics or astronomy or chemistry will stand for a minute or advance a single step ? So, you see, that scepticism is not only a dangerous thing but it is also a great handicap in the way of any kind of advancement in knowledge or material progress. I would better die rather than be a sceptic. I refuse to believe that scepticism is inherent in the human mind. There are some degrees of scepticism but there should be a limit to it just as there should be a limit to dogmatism also. Both dogmatism and scepticism are the two opposite characteristics of the human mind ; both are necessary when pursued to some extent, and both become a curse when pressed beyond limit ! It is only when the human brain goes off its hinge that one becomes an absolute sceptic or an absolute dogmatist. The normal mind always hangs between the two upto a certain limit otherwise it can not learn anything. If you always question your teacher and always suspect that what he tells you is not correct, how can you pick up even the elementary knowledge of anything ? On the other hand, if you take as self-evident truth whatever your teacher says, you will not be able to develop your mind, you will not be able to distinguish between right and wrong, between good and evil or between truth and falsehood

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I do not know why I am inclined to be a nihilist, particularly because I have lost all faith in religion and morality. Don't you think that all religions are shams and

all moralities are useless things ? Honestly speaking, what does it matter to you if you are not a follower of Christ or of Buddha or of Mohammad ? If you carry on with your life's duties *i.e.* if you work for your health and prosperity, for your peace and harmony, would it matter in the least if you are not a Christian or a Muslim or a Hindu or a Buddhist ? I do not think, it will affect your life or career any way. There are so many people who do not even understand what religion is, who do not follow any of the dogmas laid down in any of the world scriptures, who do not go to the church or the temple or the mosque, and yet who are doing in life no better, no worse than any body else who is well-read in the scriptures, who recites the words of the Bible or the *Quran* or the *Gita* daily, morning and evening, who visits the various places of worship, who goes out on pilgrimage occasionally to Jerusalem or Mecca or Hardwar. Religion, is my opinion, is nothing but a bundle of certain conventional principles which have been laid down by certain human beings, who are no better than myself or yourself ; and therefore, what is the fun of following such principles when you or I also can lay down certain other principles for our mutual observance ?

I want to ask you one question, gentlemen,—has the world grown better or worse by following the various religions discovered or founded by certain persons whom we regard as great seers, prophets and messengers of God ? If you think that the world has grown a whit better, how is it that millions of staunch believers in religion are committing many impious acts—telling lies, deceiving others, exploiting the poor and the weak, doing all sorts of unprovoked injuries and cruelties which even beasts in the jungles would not possibly do ? How is that throughout human history and throughout human faith in religion or in God, various groups of human individuals—tribes, sects, communities, races, nations—all have been fighting with one another only to bring about common destruction ?

In my opinion, whether I believe in any religion or not, I am always the very same man just as I was born—neither better nor worse—; and hence, what is the fun of believing in any religion of the world. My religion is to earn my bread, whatever may be the means of earning ; and myself is my God

because I have to preserve myself by working for my food, and I have to protect myself against destruction by fighting against my enemy—god or devil !

As for morality, I have no reason to believe in it because it is no less conventional (artificial) than religion. It is good to say that we should not tell lies, that we should not deceive or cheat or swindle or rob others, that we should be kind, generous and sympathetic to others, that we should lend our left cheek also to the man who slaps us on the right cheek, that we should exercise self-control, self-restraint, moderation and temperance in our food and drink, in our thought and speech, in our action and behaviour. But the question is, does any body follow these maxims, or has any body been really benefitted by these codes of morality ? Do you think that honesty is really always the best policy ? If it were so, how is it that the honest man mostly starves in food and drink, is deprived of employment or of any lift in his employment ? How is it that an honest man has often to suffer public humiliation and even has to go behind the bars for speaking the truth while a dishonest man does not suffer any way but on the other hand prospers well in his life. Do you think, the traders and the businessmen, the politicians and the lawyers are honest people ? And yet you find most of them as millionaires or as Ministers, Prime Ministers and Presidents of the various countries ! Then again, why should the robbers and the dacoits, the forgers and the swindlers, the thieves and the burglars have one kind of morality, and others have another kind ? Do you mean to say that the criminals and the exploiters do not prosper in life much more than ourselves who follow a different kind of religion and morality ? The fact is that God or religion or morality has nothing to do with our material progress or prosperity or even with our intellectual progress or advancement. Hence, it is better to be a nihilist or a sceptic or an atheist !

Sixth Speaker

Gentlemen, I have listened to the arguments of all the speakers, and I have developed a kind of nausea for them all ! I would never like to be an atheist or a sceptic or a nihilist,

and I will tell you why. Please listen carefully to the following arguments :—

1. Without any faith in something one can not exist in the world because faith is the source of courage, inspiration, energy, hope by which every human being has to live.

2. Whether there is any God or not, we must believe in some protector, some creator, some governor of our life. If we do not believe in some supreme power, we can not have any consolation at heart, no peace of mind.

3. Religion may be conventional, and yet it has some value in human life, because without religion a man becomes reckless, desperate and insane. Ofcourse, too much of religion is also bad, because it makes one a fanatic or a lunatic.

4. Morality may also be as conventional as religion, and yet it has also a great value in human life. Both religion and morality make us disciplined in life, and without such discipline either of the body or of the mind, there will be very little of happiness or peace in the human world. Just imagine the state of affairs in which every body acts according to his own instinct or impulse without caring for the good of others, what will happen to the human race? I think, the family, the society, the government—all will be scattered just as the universe would be disintegrated if there were no law of gravitation. Religion and morality are, therefore, just like the law of gravitation, a binding or cementing principle which brings together or holds together the scattered human individuals all over the earth.

5. Scepticism, atheism and nihilism—all are perverted instincts of human nature, and they can never appear in the normal man or woman. Of the three, scepticism and nihilism are most harmful, while atheism is not beneficial at all. Hence, in my opinion, all the three must be discarded altogether if we want to live a happy, harmonious and peaceful life on earth.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	60	out of 100	marks
Second Speaker	"	55	" "	" "
Third Speaker	"	65	" "	" "
Fourth Speaker	"	55	" "	" "
Fifth Speaker	"	70	" "	" "
Sixth Speaker	"	55	" "	" "

REVIEW

Most of the speakers have done well. Considering the abstract character of the proposition, it is creditable for the speakers to have tackled it in the manner they have done.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board little expected that the speakers would do so well in understanding correctly the real significance of the words—atheism, scepticism and nihilism. It seems, the youths of our country are becoming philosophic inspite of the impact of materialism of the modern world !

Discussion No. 38

SHOULD MAN OR WOMAN RULE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, I do not know why it sounds absurd in my ear when anybody says that woman should rule. But where should she rule ? If it is in the household, it is perfectly alright because it would be perfectly in keeping with her sex and with the mission for which she is born on earth. From the very dawn of the human race, woman has been performing only two functions—the function of bearing child and the function of looking after children and looking after home. Man has been performing only one function—the function of earning bread for the family or protecting family from starvation or extinction. But unfortunately, gentlemen, woman of the present century has started thinking that she has to answer the function of man too probably because she is enjoying these days a little bit of freedom outside home or because she has been receiving practically the same kind of education which man has been receiving. But, gentlemen, I can assure you that this is an unnatural way of thinking because woman is definitely weaker and far more delicate than man, although she can undergo any amount of hardship at home. She has been actually shouldering all the domestic work all alone even when there is some servant at home. Woman is the fittest cook, the most capable manager of household affairs, the best caretaker of children and the most capable nurse at the sick bed. It is absolutely wrong to think that woman on that account can be also a capable administrator of public affairs or a good legislator or a capable judge in a court of law or an intelligent advocate to depend her clients against

the penalties of law, and least of all, a good engineer, a capable physician or a member of the military personnel *i.e.* an officer of the Armed Forces. I do not deny that in moments of emergency both man and woman may have to change their places or share the same duties and responsibilities at home as well as out-of-doors. But then, such an emergency should not make us believe that woman can or should do the work of man. I, therefore, say that it is man's function and not woman's function to rule. Woman should rule only in the hearts of men and not in the Parliament or in the Cabinet or in the battle field. If she is made to do so, you would be putting the cart before the horse !

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, the first speaker seems to be prejudiced against woman. He probably forgets human history how at certain intervals of it woman ruled in place of man, how she performed the functions of man—in earning bread and protecting the family. In the ancient matriarchal family woman was the head, the ruler, the dispenser, the protector and everything else, while man played the subordinate role probably because he was the weaker sex or because there was much of scarcity of men during those intervals of human history. Ofcourse, it does not mean that man bore children (laughter !) or was confined within the four walls of his house or performed all the household duties—from cooking food to clearing the utensils, from looking after children to looking after the home. Man was man and woman was also woman even then although they sometimes shared their duties at home or outside home.

If we take the statistics of the various employments outside home which both man and woman are doing these days, and if we compare their capabilities in each field we shall probably find that woman is as capable and efficient as man in all sorts of work—as a judge, as a lawyer, as an engineer, as an administrator, as a legislator, and even as an ambassador in various countries or as a member of the Parliament or of the Cabinet. In our own country we have the most brilliant examples of such high and responsible offices being held by some of our women *e.g.* Mrs. Indira Gandhi is now the Prime Minister of our Republic ; Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit worked as India's

ambassador in Great Britain, Russia, U.S.A. and other countries ; Mrs. Sarojini Naidu worked as the Governor of Uttar Pradesh for some years, and her daughter too is now working as the Governor of Bengal. Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani worked as the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh for some years ; and many of our women are members of the Parliament and the State Legislatures while many others are working as competent lawyers, physicians, administrators and even as engineers. In the face of such statistics, how can you say, gentlemen, that woman should not or cannot rule ? In my opinion, woman can prove a much better teacher, a far more capable physician, and an equally capable administrator or legislator as man.

Many of us have the wrong notion that woman is less intelligent than man or less shrewd or less diplomatic than man. Woman's superiority or equality in intelligence has been proved all over the world in all fields except where there is a contest of physical strength. Woman can never match man as a boxer or a wrestler or as a fighter in the battle-field or even as a sportsman probably because Nature has made woman physically weak and delicate, and she is made further weak and delicate by her child-bearing function ; otherwise in the matter of brains, intelligence, courage, diplomacy etc., woman is quite a match for man. It is a pity that woman has been always pushed into the backward by man but why ? Is it because man is extremely selfish and jealous ? Man probably does not want woman to be his rival in the struggle for existence, and why ? Probably because man is proud and vain ; he wants to claim all the credit of the struggle for existence, although you know, gentlemen, bearing children, looking after home and doing all the household duties are not less heavy or hard tasks than earning money by working in the office or in the workshops. But then, both women and children (who are less than women) are now-a-days working for atleast eight hours a day in the mills, workshops and factories all over the world wherever there has been some amount of scientific and industrial development.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I too agree with my preceding speaker that woman richly deserves to rule and should rule whenever it is necessary for her to do so. But if you want to know from me

if woman alone should rule because she will prove to be a better ruler than man, I would beg to differ from you with all my regards to womanhood. Woman may be a better teacher, a better manager of the household, a better caretaker of children but she can not claim to be a better lawyer or a better judge or judicial officer or a better physician or surgeon, a better engineer, a better administrator or legislator. Would you like to know the real deficiencies of woman? Woman is mostly nervous, impulsive, impractical, hasty, and without much of foresight or insight. In moments of danger, she is frightened out of wits and she becomes so nervous and panicky that she often falls into a fainting-fit! She is extremely impulsive, and that is why, she is fickle-hearted too. She changes her mind too frequently; she can not stick to one and the same thing for a long time although she is more constant than man in love or rather in matters of the heart. That is why, Victor Hugo has said that love is an episode in a man's life but it is life itself in the case of a woman. Woman is also considerably hasty. She jumps at any and every conclusion, and that is why, most of her conclusions are wrong. She is extremely impractical except in the matter of her own interest which she will fulfil at any cost and without any failure. If you ask her to plan or organise any thing, she will wrongly do the job *i.e.* her planning will go wrong or her organisation will fail. The chief reason is that she has no foresight or insight into things. She can not see much beyond her nose; she can think only of the present but not of the future. She can not look at the bottom of things; and that is why her analysis of a problem is mostly wrong; and that is why also she is a bad judge of things. She is carried away mostly by appearances, and that is why, she is duped in most cases. It is woman and not man who generally suffers due to her lack of foresight or insight or want of judgment. For example, if a loafer comes smartly dressed before her and also talks smartly to her, she will believe whatever he says to her, and she can be influenced even to the extent of eloping with him. It is not that she has no power of self-control but that she trusts men and things too readily, and that is why, she suffers so miserably in life. The *goondas*, the *badmashes*, the villains and the scoundrels—all can make a ready victim of any woman, whether illiterate or highly educated, whether belonging to a

very respectable family or to a common stock. That is why, I am never in favour of entrusting any responsible duty to any woman unless there is an emergency *i.e.* unless man goes to the battle-front or unless there is an acute shortage of qualified men.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, whatever my two preceding speakers have said is not at all correct. I can quote you plenty of examples in which woman has shown her presence of mind, her foresight and insight, her intelligence, her practical wisdom, her determination, her tenacity, her courage, not only at home but also in public. If woman did not possess any of the above qualities how is it that four hundred years ago Queen Elizabeth ruled over England so efficiently that her reign is known as the most glorious chapter in the history of Great Britain even till today? How is it that two centuries ago Queen Victoria ruled over England as wisely and efficiently as Queen Elizabeth did? How is it that Joan of Arc in France and the Queen of Jhansi in India fought so bravely and strenuously against the British army? How is it that hundreds and thousands of women of the present century are working in the offices, workshops, research laboratories, in the courts of law, in the embassies, and even in the Armed Forces all over the world?

Gentlemen, you should revise your notions about woman; you must not have the same notion about her these days as you used to have even one century ago. Woman has stepped into the same struggle for existence along with man. She is equally qualified, trained and skilled like man, and that is why, man has been compelled to allow her to do all sorts of masculine jobs which she is doing no less efficiently than man. Woman actually has started ruling in every sphere whether man wishes it or not. She is also bearing children, doing all the household duties, looking after the children and home as much as she used to do formerly. Would you not give her the credit for performing a double task which man never did during any part of human history.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, those who want to allow woman to rule, I would call them not only feminists but also effeminate creatures.

I am perfectly aware that man in the modern century has been sufficiently emasculated ; he has been practically unsexed (laughter !) ; otherwise why should he be so fond of cosmetics, beauty products and all sorts of articles for beautification of the body ? The very dress-consciousness or person-consciousness on the part of man these days betrays that man has become effeminate. This effeminacy is probably due to man's constant touch with woman who is working with him in every field and who being the stronger personality is influencing him in every possible way. But man's present degeneration is no argument for believing that woman deserves to rule or that woman is actually superior to man or that she is capable of performing any task better than man. If you take into consideration the male species not only in human beings but even in birds and animals, you will find the male species decidedly the stronger, the sturdier, the braver, and the more intelligent species as compared with female species of the birds and the animals. In every kingdom of nature, we find that it is the male species that rules and it is the female species that obeys or submits. Why should you then think most unnaturally that woman is superior or even equal to man, and that she alone deserves to rule when man is actually ruling even these days in every part of the world ? The few examples which other speakers have quoted in order to prove the capabilities of woman, I do not deny ; but those examples form but a microscopic minority of the entire population of any country whenever woman has been doing some kind of masculine work efficiently or not. It is absolutely stupid even to think that woman instead of being the mother will become the father ! Let man then begin to bear children (laughter) ! I will have nothing to say. But can man or woman change the biological law for the sake of exchanging their roles in the struggle for existence ? Certainly not ; and therefore, I would always say that woman never deserves to rule. Man is born the king while woman is born his consort merely !

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	55	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	65	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	55	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	40	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	55	„	„	„

REVIEW

Most of the speakers have done tolerably well ; but the arguments of one or two of the speakers carry no weight because they are fantastic, illogical and contrary to facts. If there were women speakers, the discussion would have been more contested, but as it is, it is not uninteresting, dull or cheerless. Some of the remarks of the speakers are quite humorous and excite laughter.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board feels that most of arguments of the speakers are one-sided although they have been advanced with a view to create an opposition which unfortunately is not very marked or striking.

Discussion No. 39

DO YOU THINK, THE EAST AND THE WEST SHALL NEVER MEET ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, it was that mischievous Anglo-Indian poet Rudyard Kipling who remarked, 'The East is East, the West is West ; the twain shall never meet ' May I ask that poet (although he is no longer alive) how he could distinguish between the East and the West and what he found in the two hemispheres which is not agreeable to each other ? The earth is a spherical body ; the geographer has put Asia in the East and Europe or America in the West ; but on a spherical body, any country can be considered as being on the East or the West *e.g.* America or Europe can be considered as being on the East of Asia, and Asia can be considered as being on the West of Europe or America ; and hence, Kipling's distinction between the East and the West becomes absolutely meaningless.

The again, what are the special characteristics of the Eastern people and those of the Western people that they can never be agreeable to each other ? In my opinion, even those countries which are included in Europe are quite different from one another in many respects, but that does not mean that there are absolutely no points of similarity between them. Even in Great Britain, there is a great difference between Ireland and England or between England and Scotland, and yet the Irish, the Scottish and the English people are pulling on quite well together, and they take pride in being known as Britishers just as in America (U S A.) there are all sorts of races hailing from Europe, Asia, and Africa, and yet the Americans consider

themselves as one nation and find themselves in perfect agreement with one another. In India too we have so many races, communities, religions, sects, and languages, and yet we regard ourselves as one nation. It was Jinnah alone who invented the two-nation theory and got India partitioned on the communal basis. Rudyard Kipling too wanted to divide the globe (the human world) into two sections—the East and the West—in order to keep them apart so that they could never be united just as the Britishers wanted to divide the India population into Hindus and Muslims and wanted to keep them always from each other with a barrier of misunderstanding, jealousy, hatred and enmity ; but then, India is now united inspite of her multiplicity of races, sects, communities, castes, religions and languages.

In my opinion, there is no difference between the East and the West or between the Eastern and Western people because they are at bottom all human beings, and they have the same impulses, instincts, thoughts, ideas, views, ambitions, weaknesses etc. : and hence, they do not consider themselves as alien to one another, as Rudyard Kipling wants them to believe.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I thoroughly disagree with the first speaker and I am offering the following arguments, facts and figures to show that Eastern people are quite different from the Western people :—

1. Some of the Eastern people are most backward, uncivilized, ignorant and superstitious *e.g.* China, India and Japan. Australia also can be included in this category because eighty per cent of the population of Australia are barbarians, while twenty per cent of it, who form the Settlers from Europe, particularly from Great Britain, are enlightened, and who have actually developed Australia. Japan at present is far more advanced than even Great Britain in certain respects but three or four decades ago, she was backward and uncivilized. China is still most uncivilized and barbarous inspite of her military preparations for conquering the world ! So far India is concerned, she has advanced slightly in science and industries only ever since her political independence ; otherwise inspite of her high spiritual culture and philosophy she was no better than

China or Japan or Australia. Rudyard Kipling would not have included Australia but Australia is actually in the Far East and she can not be included as any of the western countries like Europe or America.

2. The languages of China, Japan, India, Australia are quite different from one another. In India alone there are fourteen main languages. In Australia, the language of the Bushmen is quite different from that of the Settlers who speak mostly English and some of the European languages. It is because of the language of Australia and also because of the white skin or rather of the original stock of the people that Kipling never wanted to include Australia as one of the Eastern countries. The language of China is quite different from that of Japan as the language of Japan is absolutely different from that of India.

3. There are many islands in the Pacific such as Borneo, Sumatra, Java, Singapore, Indonesia, Thailand, Malayasia etc. all of which are situated in the South East of Asia. The languages of these islands too are quite different from those of the neighbouring countries.

4. The countries and islands in the Far East have different religions as they have different languages. The chief religions, followed in these territories, are Buddhism, Christianity, Islam and Hinduism (only in India). Christianity has come from Europe; Buddhism came from India while Islam came from Arabia.

5. In complexion, shape and bodily appearance, the peoples of the Far East are quite different from one another—the Japanese and the Chinese are yellow in complexion and dwarfish in size; the inhabitants of the South East Pacific islands are also yellowish in complexion and dwarfish in size; but Indians are darkish in complexion and dwarfish in size while the Australians are whitish like the Europeans and exceptionally healthy, tall and strong probably because of the butter and milk which they take in plenty and which they produce in as much abundance as it is produced in Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Holland.

6. The Chinese, before the advent of Communism, were

a race of opium-eaters, the most inactive race in the world ; but the Japanese are always most active, because men, women and children—all are most busily engaged with all kinds of work in Japan unlike in India and China. Indians are also a very inactive people, and that is why, Nehru proposed that they should be condemned to hard work. The Chinese have been recently made active by the Russians. The Japanese are most artistic by nature, and yet like the Europeans and the Americans they are most materialistic, and that is why, of all the Eastern countries Japan is most advanced scientifically and industrially. Just before the last Second World War, Japan was so very powerful that she challenged even America which is now the richest and most powerful country in the world. But Japan has been much pulled down by her military occupation (American and British occupation for some years since 1945). Japan was ambitious of ruling Asia just as China is ambitious of ruling the world ! But both are sadly mistaken in their dreams. Fortunately, India has no territorial dreams unless she changes radically like China in another quarter of a century.

7. India is most spiritualistic or rather idealistic in temperament ; she is averse to materialism, and that is why, she has been so backward in science and industries or in material prosperity. But China, Japan and Australia are quite different from India atleast in this particular respect. Can you find anywhere else in the world such a large number of temples and places of pilgrimage ? Can you find in any part of the world such a huge number of religious mendicants, beggars, *sadhus*, *fakirs* and *sanyasis* ? In this particular respect only you can consider India as diametrically opposite to Europe or America because Europeans and Americans are most keenly attached to materialism, and that is why, they are so much advanced in science and industries. But then, India's ancient philosophy and culture, her spiritualism and idealism are completely dead except in her lethargic ways of life and lotus-eating (dreaming) spirit !

8. The Chinese, the Japanese, the Indians, the Australians and the people of the various islands in the Pacific wear different kinds of dress. There is some similarity in the dress of the Chinese and the Japanese as there is some similarity in

their appearance and complexion too ! The Australians wear the European dress because they pose to be Westerners just as Kipling used to pose himself to be an Englishman although he was an Anglo-Indian and a thorough-bred native of India ! Indians put on either *dhoti* and *kurta* or *kurta* and *pyjama* although the English educated section of the Indian population love to put on the English dress and speak the English language !

9. So far food is concerned the Eastern people live mostly on rice and wheat, fish and meat but the Australians live mostly on wheat and barley and meat and consume the largest quantity of milk and butter in the East, and that is why, they are the healthiest, the strongest and the most stalwart people in the Eastern hemisphere. The Japanese and the Chinese eat also frogs, locusts, lizards etc: Indian Hindus live mostly on vegetables while Indian Muslims live on meat, fish and eggs although the Bengalees are extremely fond of fish while the Burmese are equally fond of frogs ! The Eastern people are the greatest tea-drinkers in the world because tea is grown in the East only, and particularly in India.

10. You will find much of polygamy in India and China and nowhere else in the Far East. China and India alone believe in multiplying their population like mice and lice, and that is why, the present population of India is more than five hundred millions while that of China is above seven hundred millions both of which taken together would be exactly one third of the entire population of the world ! This explosive population of India and China has struck a terror in the hearts of the Europeans and the Americans who are therefore trying their best to reduce the population of these two countries by preaching family planning or by carrying on armed conflicts from time to time in some of the Eastern territories.

11. Ideologically speaking, the people of the Far East are not so much interested in politics as the Europeans, nor are they interested in increasing the wealth of their countries as the Americans are. It is only recently that China has been lashed into political fury or rather into military ambition for territorial expansion as well as for the propagation of Maoism (not communism) over the whole of Asia if not the whole of the world. Japan is also not so much interested in

politics as she is interested in scientific and industrial developments ; and so far Australia is concerned, it is the British settlers who are trying to make the Austrahans politically-minded, although the Australians are more inclined to farming (dairy and not agriculture), sheep-rearing and wool-trading.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, the second speaker has tried to point out the differences between the Eastern and the Western people in order to prove the truth of the baseless remark of Rudyard Kipling but he has pointed out mostly the differences among the Eastern people and not between the Eastern and the Western people, and therefore, his position is not at all tenable. As a matter of fact, most of the Eastern people are essentially the same as the Western people in food, in dress, in religion, in ideology etc. The European costume is now-a-days the universal costume of the world population ; the food of the Eastern and the Western people is practically the same, the only difference being probably that Western food is more balanced and scientific while Eastern food is ill-balanced and unscientific, and that is the chief reason why the Eastern people are physically much weaker than the Western people.

Then again, it is not at all a fact that the Eastern people are not interested in politics ; It is also not a fact that they are not interested in science and industries or in the materialistic outlook on life. The chief reason for the Idealistic temperament is the habit of idleness which the Eastern people have been cultivating due to the enervating influence of their climate and also because of the richness of their lands which have been yielding plenty of food with the minimum of labour ; it may be also due to the late advent of science in the Eastern hemisphere. I do not think that the Japanese are as inactive as the Chinese or the Indians ; but on the other hand, they are equally active as the Europeans and equally ambitious like the Americans.

Further, America is known as the "new world" because it was discovered only four centuries ago; but then, Europe and, particularly, Great Britain influenced America a good deal, and that is why, during the past one century only America

made tremendous progress in science, in trade and industries, in technology, in agriculture and in many other directions in which even Europe is lagging far behind ! So, we cannot say that at present any of the Eastern countries is less interested in politics or in science or in trade and industries than any of the European or American countries. The only handicap of the Eastern countries is that their explosive population is now retarding their economy. But then, South America is not at all as much advanced as North America, and many of the countries of Europe are also as backward as some of the Oriental countries. But if we take into consideration the continent of Africa we can well compare it with the China of three or four decades ago. Africa has been unfortunately in the grip of the European powers as India has been in the grip of the Britishers for nearly two centuries, and this alone should explain the comparative backwardness of both Africa and India. But then, there are distinct signs which clearly indicate that Africa is waking up from her trance and India has already made some advance ever since her Independence in 1947.

Last of all, the latest means of communication by land, water and air as also the organisation of the world bodies like the United Nations and the Commonwealth of Nations and also the Afro-Asian Federation, have actually brought all the nations of the East and the West much nearer to one another than they were ever before. The network of trade and commerce, the cultural contacts, the spread of education, the rationalisation of the orthodox views of religion by science—all have helped to remove slowly and gradually the barriers of distinction between the various peoples and nations of the world ; and hence, it would be now wrong to say that the East is East, the West is West, and the twain shall never meet."

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I can not still agree with my preceding speaker who says that there is no difference between the East and the West and that they are meeting or have already met in the present century. Ofcourse, I wish that there is world unity, one world government and world harmony; but then, somehow or other some kind of misunderstanding or hatred has been developed between the East and the West ; the West has deve-

loped a superiority complex while the East has developed an inferiority complex for reasons best known to themselves but we know that this difference has been accentuated particularly by the complexion of the skin as also by the comparatively early or late developments of science and industries in the West and the East respectively. Why do the Europeans and the Americans hate or look down upon the Negroes? Simply because the Europeans and the Americans are white-skinned while the Negroes are dark-skinned. Similarly, the Asians also are more or less dark-skinned (although they are not black-skinned like the Negroes), and hence, they are looked down upon by the Europeans and the Americans. I do not know if the Russians also consider themselves as Europeans, and as such, superior to the Chinese, the Japanese and the Indians although half of Russia lies in Asia while the other half lies in Europe! John Gunther, one of the greatest political prophets has predicted that there will be a great war sooner or later between the white races and the dark races to settle their quarrel for ever over the complexion of their skin! Bertrand Russell has already predicted that the population of the West will be completely swamped by the population of the East. But I would like to predict further, namely, that in the war between the East and the West, the white races will be partly destroyed and partly made bond-slaves for centuries as the dark races have been so far enslaved and exploited by the white races! I do not believe that either the Commonwealth of Nations or the World Nations or any other mock federation of nations can save the situation. Africa will take the greatest revenge upon Europe, while China will have her reckoning on America. Japan may join hands with both Africa and China; but India will stand aloof because of her philosophy of non-violence and her policy of non-alignment.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	75	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	65	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	50			

REVIEW

It is regrettable that very few speakers took part in the discussion. Is it because the topic was difficult for the candidates or because the candidates were not well-informed on the subject ? But then, Rudyard Kipling's remark about the East and the West is quite famous in the political world, and it richly deserves the world's serious consideration. Anyhow, two of the speakers have done very well, while the other two have not done badly either.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The topic for discussion was unusually interesting but unfortunately it failed to capture the imagination of our boys. The Board, therefore, regrets that quite a small number participated in the discussion although two of the speakers have done very nicely indeed !

Discussion No. 40

SHOULD WE LEGALISE ABORTION OR NOT ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, I do not seem to follow why the Roman Catholics as well as the Orthodox Hindus are not in favour of abortion. Do they consider it as a sort of crime, but why? Do they want to make any distinction between voluntary abortion and involuntary abortion, and are they in favour of voluntary abortion? So far the Hindus are concerned, they believe in procreation for the perpetuation of the male species because the male species, according to the Hindu scriptures, can alone expiate the sins of the departed ancestors and thereby they can absolve the ancestors from rebirth, which, they say, is due to sins in one's life. The idea is that sins are likely to be committed by everybody, and hence, everybody more or less has to be reborn over and over again in order to suffer on earth and expiate his sins. But if a son is born to a man, he alone can expiate the sins of his ancestors and thereby save them from rebirth! That is why, the orthodox Hindus consider abortion as a kind of sin because it prevents the possibilities of the birth of a male child! "*Putra*" in Sanskrit means a male child, and it further means one who saves somebody else from "*put*" or hell! This may sound funny but it is a fact. So far the Roman Catholics are concerned, they do not believe in voluntary abortion probably because they consider it as going against the laws of nature, because the birth of a child comes under the biological law, and it has got to be obeyed by all as the Bible says that we must "increase and multiply" But then, the Bible said this two thousand years ago and with regard to some particular country or territory where the population was scarce; but no Christ or Mohammad or Buddha would

now-a-days say to the Chinese or to the Indians, "Increase and multiply" particularly when both the Chinese and the Indians are multiplying their species like mice and lice !

But whatever the Hindus or the Roman Catholics may have to say in the matter, I am strongly in favour of legalising abortion, not only for checking the growth of population but also for the health and prosperity of the future generation. Don't you think that the mother of too many children is completely run down in health or the father who has to maintain a big family is equally shattered in health by too much of the strain which is put upon his shoulders for meeting the expenses of a large family ? Ofcourse, if the State were to shoulder the responsibilities of maintenance, education etc. of the children, nobody would feel happier than myself by obeying the commandment of "increase and multiply" ! But then, unfortunately, nobody wants to bear the burden or the folly of others ; and that is why, I am strongly in favour of voluntary abortion. As regards involuntary abortion, nobody has got any hand over it, and therefore, there is no question of legalising it or not.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, the people of the modern century after having learnt a bit of science want to violate every kind of the natural laws ; otherwise before the advent of science, or rather before the discovery or invention of the contraceptives, nobody could think of voluntary abortion or of legalising it. Science has made us cruel and beastly ; otherwise how could we think of killing living beings in their embryo by some scientific means or method ? Why should we not be considerate in the matter of marriage ? Why should we allow any and every body to marry ? In our country, it is the parents and the grand-parents who are chiefly responsible for premature, reckless and inconsiderate marriage. The greatest weakness of Indian parents is to get their children married at an early age, whether they are capable or not of shouldering the responsibilities of marriage, in order to have grandchildren round their knees ! India is indeed a very poor country particularly when we know that her *per capita* income does not ordinarily exceed fifty rupees per month. Now, if the sons of such a poor man are married much before

they have completed their studies or before they have secured any employment so that their income may supplement the poor income of their father, is it not both a sin and a crime on the part of such a father to get any of his sons married like this ? And if any stupid father commits this folly, should he not advise his son or sons to use contraceptives or advise his daughters-in-law to have voluntary abortion in case they happen to conceive ? The best course is not to encourage marriage recklessly as most of the Indian parents do ; and if they at all want to get their children married before they can possibly earn any reasonable income for the maintenance of their family, they should also believe in family planning, in the use of contraceptives and also in legalising abortion

In my opinion, the use of contraceptives or sterilization of the married partners is the safest remedy for any kind of reckless marriage, and next to that is voluntary abortion in case the use of contraceptives fails although sterilization can never fail ; but then, some people may not agree to get sterilized for fear of forever losing the chance of procreation or getting children in case there would be a necessity for it e.g. in the case of those who have got only one issue may hesitate to get themselves sterilized because in case that issue happens to die early, there will be no prospect of perpetuating the family with all the best efforts they might make !

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I am not in favour of legalising abortion for the following reasons :—

1. Repeated abortions definitely undermine the health of the mother ; even one abortion may cost her very life.
2. Legalisation of abortion would lead to a large-scale corruption between the two sexes whether before marriage or after marriage.
3. Even in U.S.A. abortion has not been legalised, not because of any orthodox view against abortion but because the population of U.S.A. has been dwindling during the last two decades and therefore the Americans want vehemently to increase and multiply.

4. If abortion is legalised in India, our government will have to establish several clinics in our country which will involve huge expenses and which our country cannot possibly afford.

5. Voluntary abortion by surgical or chemical means is definitely a criminal procedure because it kills the living embryo of human life. If infanticide, murder or suicide is a crime, abortion also should be considered as a crime. Can any sensible government undertake such a mass-scale commission of the most cruel and heinous crime ?

6. So far the growth of population is concerned, it is controlled, checked and reduced by Nature herself by sending to the earth epidemics of certain diseases such as cholera, pox and plague, by producing floods in the rivers, by causing earthquakes, and also by creating armed conflicts between nations at certain intervals. So, man need not bother about population at all !

7. The human heart everywhere in the world has the tenderest spot for religious feelings, and so if abortion militates against the religious feelings of the Hindus or of any other race in our country, we should not undertake to enforce abortion.

8. Why should we not try to improve our agriculture and grow more food ? Why should we not try to develop our industries within our means so that our growing population may be well provided with food, cloth and shelter ?

9. We should ban all undesirable marriages *i.e.* marriages of the disabled, crippled and diseased persons as well as of those who cannot earn their living decently.

10. Contraception by artificial methods—chemical, mechanical or surgical methods—should be adopted in place of abortion because contraception does not kill but merely prevents the birth of a child.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am not a sentimentalist, and hence, if we can kill rats and mice, locusts and other pestilences for the preservation of our food and thereby save the lives of millions,

what objection can there be on earth in legalising abortion which does not even mean killing an infant in the embryo ? We live in an age of science, and by means of science we have got to survive in the world. Why should we depend upon natural calamities like floods, famines, epidemics of diseases and earthquakes or even occasional wars for the check or reduction of our growing population ? In the first instance, what is the guarantee that Nature will bring about a war or a flood or an earthquake or an epidemic just in time when we badly need it ? Then again, we should not be at the mercy of Nature when we have partly conquered her by means of science. We should, therefore, apply our scientific knowledge everywhere, not only in birth-control but also in the prevention of diseases, in fertilizing sterile lands, in collecting all the richest minerals from the bowels of the earth, in improving the quality of food, the quality of vegetables and fruits, the quality of the fowls, the quality of some of the cattle which are of service to us, and even the quality of the human species ! There should, therefore, be no shyness or hesitation, no guilty consciousness while legalising or enforcing abortion for the good of our population.

Gentlemen, it is a wrong idea that repeated abortions undermine the health of the mother. Do you mean to say that repeated child-births do not affect her health seriously ? Surely it does. Hence, where is the crime in abortion, where is the risk in it ? Many things have been forbidden by religion but do we not violate religion at every step whenever it clashes with our self-interest *i.e.* mostly with our bodily desires ? It is forbidden in the *Quran* that Muslims must not drink wine, must not cultivate music or painting or dancing, must not eat pork, and must not do many other things ; but how many of the Muslims obey these injunctions ? The Hindu scriptures forbid the eating of beef by the Hindus ; but I should like to know honestly how many of the educated and cultured Hindus either in India or abroad follow this injunction ; and yet there is such a great agitation in our country against cow slaughter ! So, I say that religion is meant for the heart and not for the head. In the present world—the world of science—there is no room for the heart but there is every room for the head only ! Hence, we should not hesitate for a moment to legalise abortion because otherwise we are going to face disaster after disaster

every year—the disaster of food famine due to which we have to beg, borrow or steal food from all corners of the world on humiliating terms !

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I do not agree with my preceding speaker when he says that this is an age for the head and not for the heart. What does he really mean ? Does he mean to say that we should kill, murder, swindle, cheat, exploit our fellowmen by means of our head (brains) as best as we can, and we should altogether forget the qualms of our heart if there be any reaction to our criminal acts ? Does he mean to say that from human beings we should all try to be beasts ? No, gentlemen, it is not a sane advice. We must use our heart as well as our head in all our actions ; otherwise why should Nature have given the heart to human beings only, and not to any other creature ? Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of our Nation, was never in favour of abortion, not even of any kind of contraception by artificial methods ; he believed, on the other hand, in self-restraint or self-control in the matter of sex-union with one's married partner. He used to say further that there are some safe periods for avoiding conception every month *i.e.*, fifteen days after the cessation of menstruation and one week before the beginning (onset) of menstruation. Mahatma Gandhi used to say that if Nature can assign some particular months or seasons in the year for mating between animals or birds or other lower creatures, why should there not be specified days for sex-communion between the married partners ? If the birds and the beasts can observe the restricted months or seasons, why should we not observe particular days in the month for abstinence ? Gandhi's arguments are irrefutable because they are supported by the biologists and the medical authorities.

If abortion were such a healthy or harmless thing, if it were not full of other more disastrous consequences such as corruption or illicit sex-relations before or after marriage with unlawful partners, the English people, the Americans, and most of the Europeans would not have put up such a vehement opposition to abortion whenever or wherever it was proposed by some people ? I, therefore, consider that abortion should

be the last thing to be legalised ; but instead we should better enforce family planning by sterilization or by any other mechanical or chemical method of contraception.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	55	„ „ „ „		
Third Speaker	„	60	„ „ „ „		
Fourth Speaker	„	65	„ „ „ „		
Fifth Speaker	„	60	„ „ „ „		

REVIEW

The present topic for discussion is one of the most important problems of the day, and hence, it is being discussed by the medical authorities, by the Sociologists, by the priestly Order, and even by the educationists. Most of the speakers under review have done fairly well ; and the arguments of most of the speakers are psychological and scientific.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has nothing to comment except to congratulate some of the speakers upon their fairly good performance. The Board merely wishes that some women speakers were present, and then, the discussion would have been more well-balanced and interesting ; but the present Board is not a Medical Board, and hence, it cannot expect any woman candidate for interview.

— — — —

Discussion No. 41

SHOULD WE IMPART SEX EDUCATION TO CHILDREN OR NOT ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, plainly speaking, I am not at all in favour of sex education to children for the following reasons :—

1. According to all the eminent sex psychologists, sex-consciousness develops at a very early age—even at the age of two or three ; and particularly in the tropical countries, children mature much earlier than in the colder countries. Hence, it is not advisable to hasten maturity or sex-consciousness by imparting sex education to little children.

2. Even if you talk only of the biological aspect of science or of the evil consequences of natural or unnatural sex indulgences, the little children will merely remember the pleasures of sex and will prematurely indulge in all kinds of sex enjoyment to fulfil their curiosity before actually their body matures.

3. Sex being the strongest instinct of human nature, it is better not to discuss it at all with little children because by discussing it you will be merely inflaming the instinct.

4. If long sermons on sex fail to have any favourable effects upon the adults, how can you expect any better effect of such teachings upon juvenile minds ?

5. The problem is who is going to impart sex education to children—the school teacher or the parents ? Is it possible for elders to discuss such a delicate subject as sex with little

children ? Then again, can little children understand anything of sex ?

6. Where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise. Hence, if little children are ignorant of sex matters why should they be enlightened on sex at all before their bodily maturity ? I think, their growing age should teach them all about sex. No instinct is taught by any body ; it comes to play in due course of time ; and hence, what is the necessity of bringing the sex instinct into play prematurely ?

7. Most of the children learn about sex from their comparatively elder friends or companions ; of course, they learn only the evil side of sex. But is there really any good side of it ?

8. You must be knowing that many of the teachers initiate their young pupils to various sorts of unnatural sex-acts such as masturbation, sodomy etc. How can you expect such teachers to impart the healthy side of sex to their young pupils ?

9. Even without the knowledge of teachers and parents or other guardians many of the children of today read much of sex literature, particularly, such sex literature as deals with sex perversions. How can you save the children from such poison ? They will swallow this poison whenever they are alone in their study, in their bed, on the roof of their house, in the bath-room and everywhere wherever there is no eye to watch them ; and so, how can you guard such children twenty-four hours ?

10. It is a fact that children these days know much more of sex affairs than their guardians do because they always keep a watch over their parents when they retire to bed or when they go to the bath-room (not latrine) or whenever they happen to be alone and get the chance of kissing and embracing or doing something else with each other. They also watch keenly when a bull climbs upon a cow or when a dog and a bitch are linked up or when two birds go on pairing (mating) upon the branch of a tree. How can you prevent the children from such observation when all living things go on mating ?

11. Some children have no idea of the real significance of their sex organs ; but if you go to impart sex education to

them, will they not learn the real significance and try to apply their knowledge at your back with any partner within the easiest reach—may be their own brother or sister ? How shocking will be such a sight to their parents !

12 Let everybody learn things in due course of time. Why should children learn about sex before time ?

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, is not prevention better than cure ? Why do we take vaccination or inoculation of any kind ? Just to prevent the attack of small pox, cholera or typhoid fever or plague—all of which diseases are dangerous and in certain cases fatal. It is not only in the case of a disease but in the case of all kinds of evil things, that we take all sorts of preventive measures, and why ? Just to save the sufferings and also the risks of life. Why do we build up an embankment or a dam—before actually any flood comes ? Because in the face of a rushing or rising flood, no dam or embankment can stand. and because a flood means a huge loss of not only food crops but also of precious cattle heads and human lives. In the case of diseases also we take preventive measures in order to save the sufferings and the loss of precious lives also ; because in the event of an epidemic of plague, cholera, pox, typhoid fever, hundreds of lives may be lost and if the diseases go on spreading, as they generally do, there may be an unlimited loss of human lives. That is why, before any epidemic breaks out, we are advised to take vaccination or any other kind of inoculation.

Wrong application of sex or undue indulgence in sex or premature indulgence in sex—all are equally harmful. Most of the children and even many of the adults do not know what great harm is done to the human body and mind (brain) by unnatural sex vices such as masturbation, sodomy, sadism, masochism, fetichism, necrophilism, etc—all of which indulgences cripple the sex organs, destroy the sex vitality or virility, ruin the health of the person who indulges in them, and hastens him to death. For example, masturbation ruins the bodily health of children, stunts the growth of their body as well of their brain, disfigures the sex organ, particularly, the male sex organ so that one cannot perform the normal sex act when he

is required to do for the purpose of procreation. Most of the habitual masturbators cannot even stand or walk erect because their spinal cord becomes crooked. Those who are sodomists ruin their sex organs for ever, and they cannot perform the sex act with any fair partner because they generally suffer from erectile impotency. Sodism, masochism, fetichism, necrophilism and other such sex perversions would not only lower the sex vitality but also prove far more dangerous to the development of the body and the mind of any victim of such sex perversions.

It is a fact that when children are not imparted any sex education in time *i.e* before their adolescence period begins, they often get into the habit of such sex perversions and thereby damage their sex organ, sex vitality, bodily health and also mental (brain) development. The period of adolescence is the most critical or dangerous period of a person's life, and if during this period, children are not properly looked after or rather not imparted proper (correct) sex education, they are sure to be misguided in their sex knowledge and sex indulgence by the domestic servants, by the school teachers or by any and every body in the street, whoever happens to meet them. Hence, in my opinion, sex education should be imparted to children in order to save them from all sorts of sex perversion which are far more harmful than the normal ways of sex indulgence.

Third Speaker

But, gentlemen, can we really prevent the children from sex perversions or unnatural sex indulgences if we impart sex education or sex knowledge to them before they attain their bodily maturity? In my opinion, it is rather doubtful if children are really benefitted by such education just as they can never be benefitted by the study of criminal psychology or criminology; rather they are injured by such knowledge or education. Do you not find, how many of the teenagers in America and even in some parts of Europe are turning out to be criminals after having read the crime stories; and that is why, the reading of such stories has been banned in U S A. For the same reason, sex education is not imparted to the school children in U.S.A., and when such advanced countries do not

encourage sex education for children, why should we encourage it in the case of our children? It is really surprising how Sweden, Norway, Holland, Belgium took the lead in this direction, namely, in imparting sex education to their school children, and the statistics also show that there has not been any favourable effect of it upon the common run of the teenagers;—as a matter of fact, it cannot be. Even in the matter of eating and drinking, if the adults are told that they should practise moderation, otherwise their health would be impaired, does any of them actually listen to such advice or warning? We are all candidates for pleasure, and we do not care how much of sufferings any undue indulgence in any kind of pleasure involves; and therefore, how can we expect the little children to practise self-restraint or self-control when they cannot even understand or realise properly the evil consequences of self-indulgence? The curiosity for pleasure is much more acute in the children than in the adults, and hence, however much we may warn them against the disastrous consequences of masturbation or sodomy or bestialism or any other sex perversion, would they listen to us? Certainly not. You may talk to the drink addicts about the thousands of evils of the drinking habit, and yet can any of them resist the temptation of drinking or give up the habit of drinking? What the full-grown adults cannot do, how can you expect the little children to accomplish it? Therefore, sex education for children is an absurd proposal; it is neither practicable nor desirable.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I want to add a few more points to what my preceding speaker has said against the proposal for sex education to children. Please consider the following facts and figures before you decide to impart sex-education to little children.—

There are so many things or ways of life in modern days which excite the sex instinct in both children and adults. How can you expect any good result without removing the causes? For example, some of the photo-plays which are produced in the Hollywood film studios are exceedingly sexy; they may be a good stimulant to the married adults but not to the little children who go to see such pictures in the company of their parents or guardians. The topless and other kinds of semi-nude garments of

modern women are most exciting to the sex instinct. Even the swimming costume is most exciting. Then again, the illustrated advertisements of various commercial and industrial commodities which appear particularly in the American periodicals are no less exciting to the sex instinct because of the various sexy poses of both men and women in those pictorial advertisements. Then again, much of sexy literature, which practically verges on obscenity, falls into the hands of the little children in every English-speaking country. Do you think, such literature does not have a very harmful effect upon the juvenile readers? Further, now-a-days, the clubs, the restaurants, the coffee-houses, the hotels in all big cities of the advanced countries make a regular display of the feminine limbs in cabarets and all sorts of semi nude dancing. Do you mean to say that all these sexy sights and scenes are banned to the children? Better ban, first of all, all kinds of sexy films, sexy literature, semi-nude garments of the fair sex, sexy advertisements, and then, talk of imparting sex education to children.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I do not agree at all with any of the two of my preceding speakers; but on the other hand, I am strongly in favour of sex education to children. I believe like John Milton, that great English poet, who once said, "Fugitive and cloistered virtue is no virtue at all." In the same way, every body—child or adult—should be made to pass through the fire of temptations, and it is only then, every one will learn truly the lessons of self control or self-restraint. It is a fact that gold is purified by the fire; so also human character should be purified by passing it through all kinds of temptations. If you want to reform a glutton, you must cram all kinds of food and drink down to his very gullet, and then alone he will cry out, "Hold, hold! I cannot eat or drink any more." Thenceforward he will develop a distaste for eating and drinking. If you want a drink addict to give up his habit, you should drown him one day into a barrel of wine, and then, he will cry out, "Save me, Lord!" In the same way, lock up a debauch with half a dozen young women for a week; he too will cry out in the long run, "Oh, I am dying, I cannot lift my body; all my limbs have been disjoined!" This is the best way of reforming all kinds of addicts to vices. So, why should you not be

able to save little children from ruin if you impart sex education to them when they are just developing their sex consciousness ?

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	60	out	of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	55	„	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	40	„	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	35	„	„	„	„
Fifth Speaker	„	30	„	„	„	„

REVIEW

The speakers do not seem to have fared well probably because they have no idea of sex psychology or the real science of sex ; and yet it should be acknowledged that some of the arguments advanced by one or two speakers are quite good and convincing while others are childish.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has only to remark that the performance is rather poor probably because the topic for discussion is not at all proper or desirable. In the Board's opinion, the question of sex education should not at all arise in the case of little children ; and it is really strange that some of the European countries have already started imparting sex education to the little children.

Discussion No. 42

IS POVERTY A BLESSING OR A CURSE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, poverty can never be a blessing because it hinders the progress of man in every field or direction. Can a school boy get on with his studies if due to poverty he can not pay his tuition fees or can not buy his text books or can not even get any nourishing food ? How can one start any kind of business if he is poor, if he has no capital to invest in the business ? Can any body expect to improve his career without further education or additional training which requires additional expenses and which a poor man can not afford ? How can a poor man afford to marry at all when he can hardly maintain himself ? How can a poor man afford to fire or warm clothes in winter to keep his body warm when he can not earn even a sufficient living ? Can a poor man ever dream of eating good food, enjoying good drinks, wearing fine clothes, possessing any of the modern amenities of life which contribute to our physical comfort or ease or mental peace or harmony or happiness ? Can a poor man ever go out on travels beyond his home in the village or the town where he has been bred and brought up ? Certainly not, because travelling is an expensive affair, and as a matter of fact, everything is an expensive affair these days. Without money you can not get your food or drink, cloth or shelter or anything in the world ; and poverty means want of money. Ofcourse, you may say that everybody is comparatively poor or rich. That is true but there should be some limit to poverty. In our country there is no limit to poverty as in U.S.A. there is no limit to wealth. These two countries form a striking contrast

to each other and teach us good lessons on poverty and wealth. The poorest labourer in our country earns not more than one rupee per day; and if the price of rice or wheat is two rupees per seer, and if the price of the coarsest cloth is nothing less than one rupees four annas per yard, how can such a poor labourer make his both ends meet? And yet millions of people in our country are making their both ends meet from day to day and from year to year till they drop into the grave. Thousands and lakhs of the poor labourers have no shelter in the big cities or towns of our country, and that is why, they sleep on the street pavements in the night. Heaven knows where they ease or evacuate themselves (answer the call of nature)! The poor villagers of our country live no better life than the labourers in the towns and the cities because they too hardly get even a single square meal a day, because they go either semi-nude or put on tattered rags; they have no shelter in sun or shower; they pass their days and nights under the shades of the trees or in hovels or in mud-houses or atmost in thatched cottages, all of which are considered as luxuries in rural areas, and hence, they do not fall to the lot of the poor easants or cultivators.

Do you mean to say that such unlimited poverty can ever be anything but a curse? Just consider the other side of poverty. Can you deny that poverty tempts crimes? What drives the people to be thieves, pilferers, burglars, forgerers, cheats, swindlers, dacoits, robbers? It is nothing but poverty. In our country, the crimes are always on the increase due to our growing poverty. When people can not get food or cloth or shelter, they must secure it by hook or by crook, by fair means or foul; and they do secure it by committing various crimes.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, in my opinion, poverty is a blessing in disguise, and not at all a crime. All the greatest men of the world—all the biggest business magnates and all the millionaires and multi-millionaires rose from extreme poverty and by their struggle with adverse circumstances. One who is born with a silver spoon in his mouth has no necessity for a struggle nor does he care to struggle for improving his position or condi-

tion further. Poverty is a kind of fillip, a sort of inspiration for work, for ambition, for any kind of enterprise. If one is poor, one grows lazy and does not feel like exerting himself; and that is why, he cannot progress any further beyond what he is. It is mostly the poor people who rise from a small station to a high position; because a poor man always exerts his best and also achieves his goal however high or distant it may be. A poor man struggles all his life, and it is the struggle which brings out all his latent talents and which makes him great in the long run. You are not possibly aware how many brilliant scholars in our country struggle with utmost poverty, and yet they steer clear of all obstacles and reach the victory stand in the long run. These brilliant scholars undergo all sorts of hardship in order to earn sufficient money, not only to meet their educational expenses but also to maintain their widow mother or sister or their little brothers at home. It is these hardships, these obstacles, these adverse circumstances that make the poor people much more fit for the struggle for existence than any affluence could make them so.

Just as poverty sometimes tempts crimes so also wealth, prosperity or affluence tempts all sorts of human vices—drinking, gambling and debauchery—in which poverty can never afford to indulge and from which vices, therefore, the poor people are saved! You must have seen how during the British rule in India, the landlords, the zamindars, the taluqdars, the Native Princes—all used to indulge in all sorts of human vices—how they used to get sometimes completely ruined in health as well as in finances. You cannot possibly quote a single instance of prosperity or of wealth in which the owner has not gone from bad to worse or in which the owner has been able to improve his position any way. You will probably say that money begets money, and hence, prosperity brings prosperity. Well in the case of a few big business magnates money undoubtedly begets money but you must be also knowing that such business magnates put in a lot of hard labour and they themselves live like the poor people although their children do live like princes. So, at the back of prosperity there must be poverty and a hard struggle; otherwise prosperity alone can not lead to prosperity; on the contrary it leads to poverty again! That is how prosperity and poverty go by turns in everybody's life.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I refuse to believe that poverty is not a curse or that prosperity is not a blessing. But how should we judge a blessing or a curse? A blessing is always the cause of pleasure, comfort, ease, peace and happiness, while a curse is the cause of pain, discomfort, uneasiness, discord and unhappiness. Honestly speaking, what is our life worth if it is without pleasure, physical comfort and mental peace? If you say that poverty is a blessing, can you enjoy or command any of the comforts and luxuries of life in a state of poverty? Look at the moneyed people—how they enjoy their life—how they live in well-furnished houses, how they move about in automobiles, in aircrafts, how they travel over lands and seas and enjoy the sights and sounds of various peoples and various countries in the world, how they eat and drink, how they put on fine garments, how they command the services of people, how they command also respect and honour in the eyes of the world, and how also they enjoy their peace of mind which is the real source of human happiness! A poor man goes ill-fed, ill-clad, ill-sheltered, and bears on his head all the burden of ceaseless anxieties and worries, and hence, he has no ease or comfort of the body or peace of his mind. How can you regard such a man as happy or how can you say that poverty is a blessing? When a poor man falls ill, he cries in pain, he cannot get any medicine, he has to toss in his bed day and night not only with bodily pain but also with mental uneasiness because he has to worry about tomorrow how to secure food and raiments for himself as well as for those who are dependent on him. But for a moneyed man, when he falls ill, atonce several doctors come to attend him, and many servants come to nurse him, and he forgets his pain and is also soon relieved of his illness. That makes the difference between a poor man and a moneyed man; and yet would you like to say that poverty is a blessing and prosperity is a curse?

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker has given you a false picture of life. A moneyed man undoubtedly commands all possible physical comforts but he enjoys no peace of mind. He has always to worry how to keep in tact whatever money he

already possesses, how to augment it in various ways, how to invest it in the safest manner and how to secure the largest return out of that investment. For the business people, money is the greatest source of anxiety and uneasiness of mind because they have actually seen that by one single miscalculation, so many millionaires have become paupers overnight. They actually lie constantly on the rack because they are not sure whether their investments will bring profitable returns or not, whether they will lose their original capital and be completely ruined or not. They toss, as it were, from the frying pan into the fire ! But a poor man has no such cause of worry or anxiety. The richer the man, the greater his worries. Do you think, money can buy anything ? It may buy any material thing but not even health and never the peace of mind. Money may command the services of people but it is all lip service and no real service. Money may secure you honour and fame for sometime but that too is artificial and insincere. A moneyed man has his enemies all around—the professional thief or the burglar, the notorious dacoit or the robber, the forger and the cheat—all of whom are always on the look out for an opportunity to rob the moneyed man. Do not be surprised at all if I go to tell you the truth that money will make even your own wife or husband, your own children, your own nearest and dearest ones your greatest enemies, because they know in their heart of hearts that the moment you are removed from this world, they will inherit your money and become themselves the master of it ! That is exactly what money makes of human beings—worse than cut-throats and murderers !

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I could not appreciate the arguments of my preceding speaker because they are mostly either exaggerations or mis-statements of facts. Money can make the dead mare go ; money can buy even justice and save your neck from the gallows ; it is money alone that draws friends all around you. If you are poor, even your own wife or children will not love you or respect you. It is money alone which really buys honour, respect, love, friendliness, fame, power, and every thing else. In these days of science, money can get back your life. So many people, whose natural heart or lung has gone

out of order, have got artificial heart or lung, and they are living just like ourselves again. If they had no money could they afford to engage the world physicians or surgeons or pay for those artificial hearts or lungs? Surely not. So many people in every country are dying like flies either of food starvation or of some foul disease or other simply because they have not money to buy their food or to pay for any kind of medical aid. And so many others are dying on the gallows (*i.e.* they are hanged) simply because they have no money to bribe the judge and revert their judgment! I still believe and will always believe that money alone can work wonders while poverty can only add to our sufferings, pains, agonies, miseries and finally our death. You may call those as summer flies or by any other name whose love, friendliness and service you buy with your money; but then, you can command them like your bond slaves so long you have silver and gold in your pocket or coffers. Money is really the most powerful magic wand with which you can work wonders but with poverty or a penniless pocket you can do nothing.

Sixth Speaker

I want to know from some of my preceding speakers, who have spoken so vehemently on behalf of money, who made Christ, Buddha, Mohammad, Nanak, Gandhi, Tolstoy, Rousseau, Shaw, Tagore, Vivekanand and many others, so famous, so much honoured and adored all over the world for generations? Did they possess money? Was it money which earned them the love and adoration of the world for all times to come? Surely not. There are many things, which are far more precious than money, but which money can never buy or acquire. Can money make a man of letters, an artist, a musician, a dancer, a wrestler, a sportsman, a scientist, a poet, a philosopher or any such thing? Certainly not. Money is so poor and powerless that it can do nothing except creating all shams around you, which will melt away like a dream, the moment money is taken away!

Money can surely make a swindler of an honest man, a debauch of a man of character, a gambler or a drunkard of a man who was never used to any of these vices; but money can never make a virtuous man, a noble character, a great philanthropist, a social reformer or a great follower of truth out of

a dishonest or fallen person. That is why, it is written in the Bible that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for the rich to go to heaven. A moneyed man is really a great sinner; he is capable of committing any crime, and as a matter of fact, a moneyed man grows richer only by foul means! If money were worth anything, if it were not worse than muck or dust or filth, why is it that all noble souls, all great men, all virtuous characters have avoided wealth? I am sure, you have no answer to my question.

Seventh Speaker

Gentlemen, may I put a counter question to my preceding speaker, namely, what makes the whole world run after money—from the poorest beggar to the richest; multimillionaire, if money has no value or is not worth anything? Even a little child feels pleased when you pay him one rupee, and why? Because he knows that with that little money he can buy many toys to his fancy. Even an old man, who has one foot in the grave, talks of his assets—his bank balance, his cash certificates, his shares in the various limited concerns and also his house and other forms of landed property;—and why does he worry about them? Because he knows that after his death all these assets, which are nothing but various forms of wealth, will enable his successors—his dear wife and his dearer children—to pull on with their existence quite comfortably and happily. Why do the big business magnates—the millionaires and the multi-millionaires—worry about their money every moment of their life, whether they are young or old? Because they know that if they lose all their money by some mis-chance they will fall from heaven into hell, because they know that without all that money nobody would care even to look at them, what to speak of loving or honouring them? That is the real worth of money—the real value of wealth—the real position of prosperity. Would you yet, gentlemen, vote for poverty, which is indeed a curse of human life?

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	65	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	65	„ „ „ „		
Third Speaker	„	45	„ „ „ „		

Fourth Speaker	secures	45	out of	100	marks
Fifth Speaker	„	50	„ „ „ „		
Sixth Speaker	„	40	„ „ „ „		
Seventh Speaker	„	40	„ „ „ „		

REVIEW

Most of the arguments of the speakers are psychological as well as practical, and hence, they carry some value. It seems from the number of the speakers, who took part in the discussion, that they were all keenly interested in the topic. Except two speakers, others have not scored very high marks but their performance should not be judged by marks alone. It cannot be denied that there is some substance in their arguments.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board notes with curiosity that most people are interested in prosperity although some of the speakers have argued in favour of poverty. If the Board were to give its honest judgment upon poverty versus prosperity, it should merely say, "The mind hath its own place ; it can make a hell of heaven and a heaven of hell," which means that even a beggar can fancy himself to be a prince while a monarch can imagine himself to be a pauper !

Discussion No. 43

WHO IS THE BIGGER FOOL—THE HUSBAND OR THE WIFE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, man is always the bigger fool, and woman makes only a toy of him. Even before marriage, one glance from a young woman's eyes kills a man outright on the very spot or makes him such a bondsman that he has to stand or sit just as she would command. Don't you find, gentlemen, how even the school boys run after the school girls? Don't you also notice how even venerable, aged professors in the colleges and the universities dance like a puppet in the hands of their girl students? Can any professor afford to disoblige any of his girl pupils if she wants some extra marks at the time of her examination? Can any male invigilator refuse to help any girl examinee in the examination hall if she wants his help in any manner either by getting some hints to some questions or by copying the answers from some book openly before the invigilator? Would any male invigilator in the examination hall help any boy in any manner? Certainly not; and that is why, I say that man always plays the bigger fool in the hands of a woman, and particularly, when they are married. After marriage, man becomes a much greater slave to his wife, not because she obliges her with all sorts of attention and service but because man has got an inherent weakness for woman although woman also may have the same for man, but then, woman has sufficient power of control over herself while man has no such control, and that is why, his weakness for her is betrayed palpably before the eyes of all!

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, it is wrong to think that husband is the bigger fool ; on the other hand, I will prove with facts and figures that wife is the bigger fool. The following are the reasons which should convince you that wife is the bigger fool :—

1. Woman is unduly credulous ; she trusts man too readily. Whatever cock-and-bull stories he may relate to her she will readily believe them all. Even if man tells downright lies, as he often does it before his wife or any other woman, she will never suspect her to be a liar but take all his words as downright facts ! That is the chief reason why the wife plays the victim to the husband !

2. Woman has the greatest weakness for flattery although man has it no less ; but then, if the husband can praise the wife tactfully at certain points, she will readily play the slave to him. For example, if the husband tells the wife that she is a paragon of beauty although she may not at all be so, she will never suspect that her husband has an eye on other women !

3. If the husband tells the wife that he loves her more than the sun and the moon, more than the very light of his eyes, she will believe every syllable of his words and feel most flattered in her heart of hearts although in reality the husband may not be at all loving his wife !

4. Woman is extremely jealous ; she can not stand any kind of rivalry with any other woman in the world whatever may be her relationship with that woman ; and hence, if man can tactfully create that jealousy, he can fool her to the top of her bent ! For example, if he says that she can cook, manage her household, look after her children, decorate her house much better than any other woman in the world, she feels highly pleased, and the husband can make her do anything and everything to serve his self-interest. But if, on the other hand, the husband tells her that even her own sister or mother can manage things much better than she, the husband will at once be registered as her enemy number one !

5. A clever husband always tries to find out what things his wife likes—whether fine clothes or ornaments or

picnics or picture-shows or dancing or sports or anything else ; and if he secures her any of these things for which she has the greatest weakness, she at once becomes his slave ; that is how he makes a fool of her.

6. In England, women love their dog more than their husband ; and that is why, there is a proverb in England—"love me, love my dog" ! But in India women love their garments and ornaments more than their husband ; and hence, in order to win your wife or to make a fool of her, you should give her more of clothes and ornaments than anything else. Indian women, and perhaps, women, all over the world, have the greatest weakness for eating and drinking ; and hence, if you can offer them sumptuous feeds occasionally, you can win them over completely and do whatever you like with them !

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, do you mean to say that man has no weakness, that he is not credulous, that he can not be won over by flattery, that he has no weakness for eating or drinking ? Do you think, man is more intelligent, more shrewd, more cunning than woman ? But woman has been always compared with a fox and a cat, and why ? Because she is as sly as a fox, and as cautious as a cat ; and that is why, she can not be fooled by man as readily as he thinks her to be. Ofcourse, there are always exceptions : *i. e.* there are men who are far more cunning and intelligent than women, while there are women who are much more shrewd and intelligent than men. Bernard Shaw has said that it is woman who tempts man who plays her victim while Shakespeare says that woman plays the victim to man's wiles. Whom would you, gentlemen, take as an authority on men and women—Shaw or Shakespeare ? I for myself would take Shaw as the greater authority than Shakespeare, because Shakespeare belonged to a century when women were really fools (Queen Elizabeth was an exception !) but Shaw was a man of the twentieth century when every woman is a siren or a witch, and therefore, Shaw is perfectly right when he says that man is the bigger fool, and not woman !

Gentlemen, man has one most vital weakness—the weakness for his life's partner—the weakness for her flesh,—the weakness for her youth and beauty. Woman may have a

similar weakness but she can control her weakness which man can never do. It is on this vital weakness that the husband is always exploited by the wife or rather made a fool ! I quote the following ways and means by which the wife makes a fool of the husband :—

1. There are some effeminate husbands who like women have a great weakness for their dress and personal decoration, and in the case of such husbands, the wife hits her husband at this vital point ; she often admires his personal appearance although he may not be at all handsome ; she flatters him by saying that he looks at his best in a particular suit, by a particular hair-cut or by trimming the moustache in a particular style ; and that is how she makes a slave of him and gets everything done by him. Would you call such a wife or such a husband as the bigger fool ?

2. The husband generally wants the wife more frequently than the wife wants the husband. There are some biological reasons for the difference. Woman wants man for impregnation while man wants women for the mere satisfaction of his *libido* i.e. his lust. It is on this vital weakness of man that woman constantly exploits him i.e. makes a fool of him.

3. Woman's greatest weapon with which she makes the biggest fool of man is the wonderful strategy of her love-play ! When man wants to catch her, she gives the slip to his hands ! When he tries to enclose her within his arms, she runs away or rather slips away from his embrace like the eel fish which is the most slipping fish among the finned creatures that live in water ! Then again, when the husband bends his head over the face of the wife to hold her lips with the grasp of a vice, she at once closes her parted lips and with a shrug of her shoulders snatches herself away from him ! Man becomes frantic at that psychological moment, and he is ready to do anything for her !

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, the wife is definitely the bigger fool because it is she who has been suffering in the hands of man all over the world. Woman is far inferior to man in intelligence. She has not got much of foresight or insight, and that is why, she plays the fool in the hands of every body. You must be knowing so many cases in which man has duped woman, betrayed

her and ultimately thrown her into the street ! Woman, as compared with man, is a thorough-bred fool. She knows only how to play petty tricks with man, and even in such tricks, she is beaten in her own game by man. Woman may pose to be intelligent but she has not even a grain of intelligence in her brain ; otherwise how can she be outwitted by any and every man ? Woman is intelligent only in guarding her petty interests, and she goes mightily pleased when such interests are fulfilled by man.

Besides, woman's demands are not much although some people say that she has an endless desire for eating, for fine clothes and ornaments, for fine decorations of her house. Woman is easily pleased or satisfied. Give her a little feed, present her a little trinket, tell her that you love her more than anybody else in the world, give her occasional kisses or even cast some amorous-glances at her occasionally, and she will go mightily pleased ! If woman were more intelligent than man, Shakespeare would not have said, "Frailty, thy name is woman !", John Milton would not have said, that woman is a fair defect of nature, Somerset Maugham would not have remarked that woman is a voracious eater and she can be purchased only with a sumptuous feed !

Everybody knows in India how woman has been made the victim by man. how much she has suffered due to her folly, and how man has proved to be more than a match for her ! During the Zamindari system, when man knew nothing but of hatching mischiefs and of merely eating and drinking and enjoying women unlawfully, you must be knowing how woman used to play the victim in the hands of the decoys engaged by the zamindars for the purpose of tempting or kidnapping particularly the young widows and even the unmarried daughters of the poor peasants and also sometimes the young wives of the weavers, the cultivators, the carpenters and other poor villagers who had neither the means nor the resources nor even the wit to protect their women against the scoundrels. The history of the lives of the public prostitutes in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Lahore and other big cities of India during British rule is a pathetic history because most of these public prostitutes played the victim in the hands of the decoys engaged by the Zamindars,

and when they had once been molested by these scoundrels or debauches they became untouchables in the eyes of society, and hence, they could not go back to their parents or guardians but had to earn their living by the immoral trade! Woman has always played the fool in the hands of man, and that is why, woman is now-a-days taking the upper hand over man with full vengeance!

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	30	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	60	„ „ „ „	„	„
Third Speaker	„	60	„ „ „ „	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	50	„ „ „ „	„	„

REVIEW

The performance has not been very satisfactory probably because the young candidates for interview are equally ignorant of the psychology of both man and woman, and yet it should be acknowledged that the second speaker and the third speaker have given considerable proof of their knowledge of human psychology

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board regrets that the discussion has not at all been upto the mark, probably because the young candidates for interview are all unmarried, and therefore, how can bachelors know the psychology of the married people?

Discussion No. 44

IS POLITICS THE LAST REFUGE FOR A SCOUNDREL ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, you must be all knowing that it is Dr. Samuel Johnson who made the above remark which has passed current all over the world, chiefly because it is a great truth. The same Dr. Johnson has also remarked that when one fails as a citizen, he becomes a patriot or rather a politician. But why Dr. Johnson has declared a politician to be a scoundrel ? In what sense is he a scoundrel ? In my opinion, he is a scoundrel in one supreme sense, namely, in the art of telling lies, in the art of deceiving others, in the art of making a fool of people, in the art of fulfilling his self-interest, in the art of practising hypocrisy, in the art of holding out high hopes to people in the beginning but betraying them in the long run, in the art of putting on smiles on the face but wearing a dagger at heart ! That is exactly what a politician is !

Politics, gentlemen, is positively a machiavellian science or art—the science or art of deception and nothing else ! You must have seen at the time of elections in every country, a politician greets everybody with a smile, how he pats the children of the poor, how sweetly he talks to them, as if he is the greatest lover of children in the world ! You have seen also how before the elections, a politician holds out high hopes before the voters that he will remove all their difficulties, solve all their problems, meet all their grievances. A politician, at the time of elections, feeds the voters, bribes them with money, gives them intoxicating drinks, takes them to the pictures and even demoralises them by even offering them corrupt women for their vulgar enjoyment !

A politician is not an ordinary scoundrel. He adopts all the foul means in order to win, in his favour, the maximum number of votes which he can never win by any open-handed policy because he is not a good or honest man in the eyes of the people, because he never commands any love or regards of the voters, but then, he is such a great trickster that he makes them forget all his wickedness just before or at the time of elections, and like a magician he wins the majority of the votes ! A politician is a scoundrel because as soon as he is elected to any legislature, he backs out from all his promises, and he becomes the cruellest instrument of people's difficulties, problems, sufferings and miseries. The people, unfortunately, having voted him once to the legislature can not undo his position or membership by any means, and that is why, it is all the more pathetic !

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, does my preceding speaker mean to say that politics is nothing but a science of villainy as it was in the hands or eyes of Machiavelli ? If politics is really such a foul thing, all politicians in the world should be branded as villains. But do they deserve to be so ? Certainly not. In my opinion, politicians are the policy-makers—the builders of the various forms of government such as democracy, fascism, totalitarianism, monarchy, autocracy, oligarchy, plutocracy. It is not our concern here to discuss the respective merits or demerits of the various forms of government but we have to discuss here whether politics is a science of human welfare or of mere wickedness and villainy as Dr. Johnson seemed to believe. There is absolutely nothing wrong with politics as a science because it is based on human welfare ; and if any of the politicians happens to be a villain or a scoundrel, it is not the fault of politics but of the politician concerned. Politics is actually a science of or a treatise on State organisation, affairs of State, questions of policy etc , and as such, how can it be a science of wickedness or villainy, hypocrisy or treachery ? Politics is primarily based on ethics or the moral science because its aim is human welfare, human justice, human peace and happiness. Politics never wants to dupe or cheat any body with a view to advance the self-interest of any particular member of a State or government against that of any other member. Plato's Re-

public is an ideal political constitution which is meant for the highest good of mankind. Democracy is a government of the people, by the people and for the people, and democracy is one of the best forms of political constitution which has become most popular in the modern world because it grants equal freedom to all without any consideration of caste or creed, rank or colour, race or nationality. Would you like to regard the science, that has made the political constitution of democracy, as an evil science—a science of hypocrisy, deception and cheating? Certainly not. There are so many other forms of political constitution such as monarchy, oligarchy, plutocracy, fascism, totalitarianism etc all of which have been devised by the politician not to advance his own personal interest but to do good to mankind. Ofcourse, every kind of political constitution has some defect or other but that is not the fault of the politician or politicians that made such a constitution. Political ideas like economic theories constantly change with the change of human relations just as economic theories also change with the change of material resources and their development. In a country which is completely illiterate or uncivilized, democracy can not be suitable. In a country which is highly advanced in light and culture, monarchy, oligarchy or plutocracy can not be suitable. Hence, we find that politics has nothing to do with anything evil.

Third Speaker

But then, how is it, gentlemen, whenever there is any employment of mean tricks, any underhand policy, any secrecy or privacy or conspiracy or intrigue why do people call it a play of politics? Now-a-days, people have become so selfish, so jealous, so faithless that one has got to use politics even between husband and wife, between parents and children, between brothers and brothers! That is why, politics has been degraded or branded as a science of playing false or foul. Even within one's own country, the person, who becomes a minister or a prime minister, a president or a governor, or even a member of the legislature, has to act not in an open-minded manner but with crookedness and hypocrisy; otherwise one can not succeed as a minister or a prime minister or a president. That is the real story of national politics which is, ofcourse, not so foul or filthy as international politics which has become literally a

science of the devil ! When a nation talks of peace, it really means war or some secret preparation for a war, which is known in political terms as cold war. When a nation invites other nations in order to form a federation of nations with the professed aim of doing good to the member-nations, its real motive is to build a power-bloc in order to increase its power or supremacy in the international sphere. When a nation offers any kind of help, either financial or technical, to any other nation, its real motive is to enslave the other nation economically as well as politically. When a nation organises peace corps with the professed aim of helping the development of other countries, its real motive is to make the peace corps work as a spy ring in order to make preparations of war against certain countries. When a certain country talks of non violence as its creed or policy, its real intention is to prepare for violence because it knows for certain that non-violence is absolutely impracticable atleast in the political field !

Then again, to talk of common-place things, if you tell your wife in the face that she is a paragon of beauty or that you love her more than the sun and the moon or more than the light of your eyes, you mean quite the reverse of it, and herein are you playing the role of a politician ! If your wife, on the other hand, praises your physical appearance and also some of your qualities (which are really not good qualities), you take it for certain that she is playing politics with you probably because she wants to keep you blind with regard to her secret admirers or paramours ! Brothers and brothers, sisters and sisters also play politics with one another now-a-days, because without politics it is almost impossible to exist in the world these days ! There is politics in the party leaders, in the traders and the industrialists, in the officials of the State, in the domestic servants and menials, in national and international relations What is Communism but a mere game of politics ? Certain cunning politicians want to make capital out of Marxism and Leninism, and that is why, they are applying machiavellianism to a good economic theory or doctrine and are thereby exploiting the poor working class ! Do you mean to say that Maoism is not machiavellianism, that fascism, totalitarianism, Nazism are not machiavellianism—a game of dirtiest politics ? What is this strife between capital and labour in the

name of communism ? Nothing but a game of politics. Labour is always exploited by capital, and yet capital always says that it is kind to labour because it provides food to labour ! What a blatant lie in broad day light ! At Geneva the big nations met several times in order to stop the nuclear race, the race in armament and the recurrence of war but in reality they met to deceive one another and to make a fool of the world at large. What else would you call it but a game of politics ?

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, people are thoroughly mistaken when they say that politics is a dirty game—a game of villainy, wickedness and treachery. They should know that politics came into existence with the development of the family and the society. When people developed some amount of the sense of justice and freedom, when they felt the necessity of living together, not at the expense of one another, but on terms of friendliness and love, when they felt the need of certain laws of freedom and restriction for governing their individual conduct, when they wanted to live in peace and not to fight with one another as the beasts in the jungle do, it was only then that they felt the need of formulating a code of laws and principles to govern their actions, and when they had formulated those codes of laws and principles they put the name of politics on them. Ofcourse, the science of politics of one thousand years ago is not the same as the science of politics of today because during this long period, man's ideas about freedom, justice, liberties, rights and duties have undergone a great change. In former days monarchy was considered as the best form of rule, but then, it was found out later on that one single individual i.e. the monarch might abuse the powers and privileges invested in him and thereby lead to dessension and rebellion in the State as it often did in most of the semi civilized countries; and hence, in order to curb the powers of the despotic monarch oligarchy and plutocracy came into existence, and they were also found to be but a form of collective despotism, and therefore, they yielded place to fascism and totalitarianism both of which were found unsuitable from the point of view of individual freedom and equality of justice, and hence, they too have been replaced in many of the progessive countries by democracy which is now considered as the best form of political constitution in the

world although now-a-days it is also being wrongly challenged by communism (which is not a political but an economic theory or creed) on the plea that in democratic countries there is exploitation of the working class by the capitalist class ! So, after having made a survey of the whole history of politics, would you still say that politics is a dirty game—a game of wickedness villainy and treachery ? Well, I do not know how to convince you otherwise if you have no eyes to see or brains to judge ?

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	55	out of 100 marks
Second Speaker	„	65	„ „ „ „
Third Speaker	„	65	„ „ „ „
Fourth Speaker	„	55	„ „ „ „

REVIEW

Practically all the speakers have done equally well although they have secured different marks. Some of the arguments of the speakers are quite original, and as such, they deserve to be noticed. It is no fault of some of the speakers to have said that politics is a dirty game because the science of politics has been abused by some of the modern politicians. One of the speakers has defended the science of politics in a masterly manner and he has been opposed also in a masterly manner by another speaker.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has nothing to comment except that politics has got to be reformed. Some of the speakers have spoken the truth when they have alleged that some of the politicians in the modern world are indeed self-interested persons, and hence, they have earned a bad name for the science of politics which is as pure and healthy as sociology. It is, therefore, our common duty to try to wash away the ill-name from politics !

Discussion No. 45

IS PLAIN LIVING AND HIGH THINKING THE BEST MAXIM OF LIFE ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, in the first instance, we have got to know what is plain living and what is high thinking, and then, we have to discuss and find out whether or not plain living and high thinking is possible in the modern world and good in any sense for mankind.

Plain living, as I understand it, means a common or ordinary standard of living which means in other words a contented living with the barest necessities of life. So far high thinking is concerned, I think, it means, having a noble ideal of life or thinking always of the elevation of the human soul. But how to elevate the soul? And what is a noble ideal of life? We can elevate the soul by cultivating certain human virtues which actually form the noble ideals of life and which constitute high thinking.

Gentlemen, I am definitely for plain living and high thinking. I am giving you the following arguments for your consideration :—

1. So far our country is concerned, it is yet a poor country, and we cannot afford to raise much our standard of living, and hence, we should be contented with plain living. If a man like Gandhi could be contented with a loin cloth and with goat's milk, why can we not be contented with the barest necessities of life such as home-spun *Khadar* for our clothes, two square meals a day which should consist of vegetables, rice

or wheat or a little bit of fish and meat for those who like them and who can also afford to have them.

2. Plain living inspires a feeling of contentment which is the real source of mental peace which again is the root of human happiness. If we go on increasing our wants of life there will be no end to it. For example, one who is not contented with a bullock cart will invariably demand a motor car or a motor truck ; but can all of us afford to have it ? Surely not. If we are not contented with a cottage, we shall positively demand to have a brick-built house which also we shall wish to be well-furnished with some of the fashionable articles of furniture or decoration. But can the teeming millions of our country afford to have such well-furnished houses or such automobiles ? Certainly not. That is why, Gandhi too advised his countrymen to be contented with merely the bare necessities of life.

3. If we indulge in any kind of costly living in dress or in food or in dwelling establishments or in the means of conveyance, wherefrom money will come particularly when the average *per capita* income of men and women in India does not exceed fifty rupees per month ?

4. If we want to raise the standard of living, as Nehru desired it, we will have to raise the standard in the case of all, otherwise there will be a pathetic contrast between the few rich and the poor many. Can a nation feel happy with such a pathetic contrast ? Certainly not.

5. Raising the standard of living means developing the various industries, and development of a lot of money. But can India afford to invest much money in the development of industries only when she has to spend much money in making her population literate and educated, and also in eradicating various diseases such as malaria, tuberculosis, plague, pox, typhoid fever, cholera etc. which take a heavy toll of lives almost every year.

6. Then again, development of industries will bring to our country the problem of exploitation of the working class by the capitalist class. Communism has already proved to be a curse atleast in China and other countries ; we are not prepared to invite communism to our country.

7. As for high thinking, India has been the seat of the highest philosophy from times immemorial, and we want to renew our ancient philosophy and we are not prepared to be misled by western materialistic philosophy which has degraded mankind almost to the level of brutes !

8. Gandhi believed in high thinking and he practised it too all his life. India probably has the largest calendar of saints, philosophers and spiritualists (high thinkers), and as such, the real spirit of India is inclined more towards the cultivation of spiritualism than to the pursuit of materialism. The world may say that the modern age is the age of science, it is the age of trade and industries, but we still believe that spiritualism is preferable to materialism because the ultimate goal of human life is not bodily enjoyments but spiritual elevation, because the body is perishable while the soul is immortal.

9. India is already fallen from high thinking, from noble spiritualism and from many of the moral virtues ; and hence, we have got to raise India to her ancient level of true light and culture. In my opinion, the light and culture of the western world or even of the eastern world is not true light and culture. Even science has been declared by our *vedas* and *upanisads* as *avidya* i.e. false knowledge ; and therefore, why should we pursue it only to land ourselves in further darkness and degradation

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker seems to be enamoured of plain living and high thinking probably because he has no eyes or because he never wants to make any progress or because he has eighteenth century or even earlier, or better say, pre-historic ideas. How can a modern man like myself subscribe to such a view of blindness and superstition ? To talk of plain living in an age of industrial developments is the height of stupidity. Who would not like to own a motor car or to fly by a jet plane or to have in one's house a cooler or a heater, latest styles of furniture—chairs, tables, dressing-tables, dining tables, side-boards, carpets, curtains etc. if one can afford them ? And even if one can not afford them, why should not one work hard to secure them ? Why should one be contented

with one *langota* (loin cloth) and one *chaddar* for the upper limbs? We are not all *mahatmas* like Gandhi. Gandhi might not have his hankering for worldly things but why should we live like *sadhus* and *sanyasis* with all the desires and hankerings in our heart of hearts? If we want to believe in plain living and high thinking, we should better retire into the Himalayas or into the jungles and live with the beasts and the birds.

Those, who talk of plain living and high thinking, would be setting back the hand of the clock of human progress by atleast three centuries. Who would like to go back to the stage of barbarism, darkness and superstition? I am not a candidate for that. I belong to the modern age and I want to live like a modern man. The motto of a modern man is not plain living but high living and plain thinking. May I like to know from any of you what you actually mean by high thinking. Do you mean to say that the cultivation of science or the aspiration for discovering and inventing things or the ambition to launch the sputniks or to travel through interstellar space is no high thinking? What is the modern world of science and industries doing except all this? Do you mean to say that high thinking means neglecting all the duties of life, running away from society and contemplating God whom we do not know nor shall ever know mean high thinking? I think that just as philosophy is nothing but mad speculation or kicking in the air and coming to no conclusion or to no landing on the solid earth, so also your high thinking means that! Well, I am not for such high thinking. And as regards plain living, I believe only in increasing my wants and trying to meet them all as best as I can. I confess that I am not Gandhi, I am not Christ, I am not Buddha but I am only a creature of flesh and blood, and I do not know if I possess any soul at all because I can not see it. I am not prepared to believe in things which I can not perceive with any of my senses—whether it is God or the Soul!

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I have already seen the end of what you mean by high living, and do you know what I have discovered in it? Only a brutal contest, nothing but selfishness, and pure and

simple animality in none of which I personally believe. It is wrong to say that believing in plain living means going back to the pre-historic stage, and high thinking means nothing but idle speculation. I am bitterly conscious how much fallen the modern world is from the normal standard of morality, how much corrupt modern mankind is particularly in the so-called progressive countries. I am also equally conscious what funny or sad interpretations some of the perverted people are now-a-days putting on high thinking which may not have any value in the eyes of those who are corrupt and morally degraded but which is highly prized by all the noble thinkers of the world. Do you mean to say that man should pursue only his bodily desires, that he should be guided by his instincts only, and not by his reason or by the voice of his conscience which is actually the voice of God in man. Do you mean to say that all the great thinkers, all the founders of religion, all the philosophers had been always in the wrong when they pursued the aspirations of the soul and not the impulses of the body? I do not think so. If it were so, how could millions of enlightened people believe in the thoughts of those great men, how could they try to cultivate those thoughts in their own life? Mahatma Gandhi's loin cloth is the greatest lesson on self-denial and self-restraint; Christ's Crucifixion is the greatest lesson on self-sacrifice, Buddha's renunciation of the world is the noblest lesson on self-abnegation and also on self-knowledge. Socrates used to say, "Know thyself first and then you will know the world." Buddha renounced the world in order to know himself, and when he came to know himself *i e* acquire *tatwa gyana* he came to know all the mysteries of this universe which no science has been able to discover till today because the knowledge derived through science is not *tatwa gyana* but *avidya* or false knowledge. I am a follower of the great men of the world, and not of the creatures who have not yet been able to transcend (rise above) the stage of the brutes or the beasts!

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I should like to know from all of you here what advance man has been able to make so far by plain living or high thinking. Have they been able to discover God or the Soul? Have they been able to mitigate (reduce) the sorrows or miseries or bodily sufferings of mankind in the least by plain

living and high thinking ? Please quote me only one instance in the whole world, and I shall be perfectly satisfied. But I know that plain living can land nowhere except in poverty and wretchedness as it has landed India so far. I know also that high thinking or empty speculation can land us nowhere except in the air !

You should certainly cut your coat according to your cloth but why should you not desire to have more than one piece of cloth in order to make more than one coat ? Indians have been always contented with the minimum of their requirements, and that is why, they have never made any effort in the direction of securing the maximum. To be contented with the minimum means to have no ambition in life ; but what is life really worth without ambition ? Nature has given us both the body and the mind for their development and not for keeping them stunted in growth. But what are the ways of developing the body and the mind ? Not surely by sterilizing all the sense-organs, not by depriving them of their various kinds of food and pleasure but by offering them the scope for expansion. In my opinion, contentment is the greatest crime. With contentment nobody can make any progress in life ; it is with ambition that one can make some kind of progress. If man were satisfied with the bullock cart, could he invent the railway engine or the motor car ; and if he were contented with the motor car and the railway engine, could he invent the jet plane ; and if he were satisfied with the jet plane, could he invent the spaceship and ever think of landing on the moon ? There would have been no progress of science or arts if man were contented with what he had in the very beginning.

Then again, man is a demi-god ; he too wants to create a world of his own ; and it is through science and industries that he can create and has actually created such a world. Why should man be contented with what Nature has given him ? Could he have any of such things as the telephone, the telegraph, the radio, the steam engine, the aircraft, the tractor, the electric lamp or the fan, the electric heater or the cooler, the various machineries which we use in the various mills, factories and workshops in order to manufacture such myriads of things ? Could we get the sewing machine, the teleprinter, the dictaphone, the typewriter, the gestetner, the printing machine, and

so many other useful and convenient things if we were contented with plain living? Could we build the towns and the cities with their magnificent buildings, with their macadamised roads, water-works, stadiums, electric installations, railway stations, aerodromes, landing ghats for the steamships, telephone and telegraph connections, electric power-houses, film studios, educational institutions, swimming pools, skating rinks, zoological and botanical gardens, and so many other things of human convenience, comfort, and recreation?

Why have not the birds and the animals progressed even an inch further during centuries and ages of thousands of years? Because they have been contented with what Nature has given to them. But man has been endowed with some instinct which makes him ambitious, curious and discontented with everything, and that is why, man is what he is today! If man had been contented with plain living and high thinking, he would have remained in the mountain caves and the jungles even in the twentieth century just as the monkey or the chimpanzee,—Darwin's original man,—is still living in the jungles and living on leaves and fruits and roots of trees!

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, I would still like to follow the footsteps of the monkey and the chimpanzee, the baboon and the gorilla and live in the jungles and the mountain caves rather than in the towns and the cities, because I know what man has made of man after having walked out of the jungles and the mountain caves. Do you think, man feels the least happy by all the inventions of science and industries? Well, a handful number may feel happy; but what about the millions who groan under the grindmill of labour in the workshops and the factories and who live in the slum-houses or rat-holes, who can not get even any wholesome food or air, who have no right even to look at the articles of comfort or the various recreations or the delicious dishes of food and drink which their own fellowmen—the moneyed people, the big business magnates, the capitalists enjoy in their heavenly homes? Wordsworth too being tired of the developments of science and industries, being

shocked by the bloody French Revolution cried out, "The world is too much with us—getting and spending and laying waste of our powers ; little we see in nature that is ours". He further still complained and wondered to find what man has made of man in this so-called civilized world ; and that is why, he wanted to go back to nature, go back to the primitive stage of human life—the Adam-and-Eve days—, and he said openly that he preferred to be a Pagan and be suckled in a creed outworn, rather than be a man of modern civilization, modern science and industries who aspires to have high living and plain thinking !

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	70	out of 100 marks
Second Speaker	„	55	„ „ „ „ „
Third Speaker	„	45	„ „ „ „ „
Fourth Speaker	„	70	„ „ „ „ „
Fifth Speaker	„	40	„ „ „ „ „

REVIEW

Two of the speakers have done very well. They have given good arguments which are not stale or hackneyed. The rest of the speakers have merely followed trail of their leaders, and hence, they are not original in their thinking or argumentation. The proposition being extremely controversial should have invited more speakers to the forum but unfortunately the present batch of the candidates seems to be rather disinterested in the discussion.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

Plain living and high thinking has become too old a proverb or a catch-phrase, and, hence, probably it did not invite any good number of speakers as it should have done. But then, the proposition deserves to be sifted by modern thinking, modern ways of life particularly under the context of the developments of science and industries.

Discussion No. 46

WHICH WOULD YOU PREFER—MACHINE OR MAN, AND WHY ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, I would surely prefer man to machine because man is the maker of the machine which is a mere tool in the hands of man, because man is the master while machine is the slave, because man possesses the brains, the mind, and the soul which drive the machine which is otherwise lifeless, motionless and useless. I prefer man to machine because man has created so many things—art, literature, philosophy, science, industries—all out of his own brain or mind or soul. But what has machine created without the brain or the skill of man? Nothing, because machine is lifeless and inert. Machine ranks with the particles of matter which are equally lifeless and inert, while man is superior not only to machine and other particles of matter but to all other living creatures—birds and beasts, insects and flies, reptiles and other crawling or winged creatures. Machine is perishable, matter is perishable like the dust particles under my feet but man is immortal—he never dies because he is the universal spirit or soul which is the source of all life and light in the universe.

I prefer man because he has freedom of the will, power of imagination, power of thinking, power of reasoning, because he has got a heart to feel, because he is not satisfied with what he is endowed by Nature, because he always tries to advance further and further, because he aspires to out-reach the sun and the moon and the stars! But what does machine aspire to do? Absolutely nothing unless man wants to direct it to create or to

destroy. Machine has been used so far for creative as well as for destructive purposes, and it has all been done by man who is the power behind machine. Some people hate man because he has directed the machine to destructive purposes, particularly, while inventing the nuclear weapons for war. It is because of the horrors of war that people have come to hate man—the scientist—and also the machine because it is a tool in the hands of man. But when we think of the various other inventions and discoveries of science, which have been made by man with the help of the machine, and which have contributed to our ease, comfort, recreation and relief of pain, we are first of all grateful to man and next to machine because both have been instrumental to the service of man although machine could do nothing without the brain or skill of man.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I prefer machine because it has reduced so much of the hardship and labour of man, so much of the anxieties and worries, so much of the pains and sufferings of man, and also because it (machine) has contributed so much of comfort, ease and pleasure to mankind. If there were no machine, man would have still to plough and spin, as Indians and other backward people are still doing; man would have still to use the bow and the arrow for hunting in order to secure his daily food, man would have to lie at the complete mercy of Nature, man would have to be contented with either raw fish or flesh or with mere fruits and roots of trees as his chief food; and what would have been the shelter for his poor head against sun and shower? Nothing except the sky or the branches of trees! What would have alleviated his agonies when he would have been tossing in the bed with all sorts of painful diseases on earth? How would he have kept his body warm in the biting or freezing chill of winter. I am sure, he would have still lived like the Eskimos of Greenland or like the Cannibals of Central Africa. But I, for myself, would never prefer such a life. I would prefer to ride a bicycle, a scooter, a motor car, a jet plane instead of the bullock cart or going on foot for miles and miles to meet my nearest relatives or friends probably once only in my life, and you know quite well how far I would have been saved during that journey from the hands of the robbers or from the teeth of the beasts.

In my opinion, machine has created a heaven on earth for us. Just compare some of the African Cannibals and the Indian gymnosophists or naked *sadhus* with the modern men of Europe and America, and you will realise the difference and what machine has made for man! Machine has completely changed even the physical appearance of man by putting in robes of so many styles and attraction, by providing him with so many delicious dishes of food and drink, by sheltering him against sun and shower in such cosy and comfortable dwelling places, by carrying him over such long distances in the twinkling of an eye and by arming him against all kinds of visible and invisible enemies, by offering him so many varieties of recreation of the body and the mind, and last of all, by relieving him of all kinds of maladies and agonies! I am grateful to machine because it has introduced me into a heaven on earth!

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I am still in favour of man and not of machine because machine has created so many problems for man, because machine has made a devil of man, because machine has added to the sufferings of man instead of relieving any of his pains, because machine has robbed man of his freedom, because machine has made a slave of man although originally man was the master of machine, because machine has robbed man of his employment, his daily food, and above all, his peace of mind, because machine has degraded man into a brute—a cruel, selfish, designing monster! I am in favour of man and against machine for the following reasons:—

1. In this machine age, man himself has become a machine, because he has lost his power of thinking, feeling or doing anything—because he has become so much dependent upon machine!

2. Machine has made man forget his soul, his god, his love, tenderness and all sensibilities because machine has made man, on the one hand, a cruel exploiter, while on the other, a victim of exploitation.

3. Machine is the root cause of all rivalries, jealousies, intrigues, treacheries, conflicts, feuds, strifes, wars!

4. Man made the machine but the machine has unmade man !

5. Machine has given man only the power of destruction because man is no longer inclined to creation.

6. Machine has made a slave of man who is no longer the master of machine

7. Machine is the Frankenstein—the monster—who is threatening to kill man—its creator !

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I thoroughly agree with my preceding speaker, and in his support, I would like to quote merely the words of Mahatma Gandhi instead of giving my own arguments because in my opinion, Mahatma Gandhi was the best man to judge between man and machine particularly when he had seen in his own life-time how man was the creator of the machine and how the machine threatened to be the destroyer of man :—

“I would categorically state my conviction that the mania for mass production is responsible for the world crisis. Granting for the moment that the machinery may supply all the needs of humanity, still, it would concentrate production in particular areas, so that you would have to go about in a roundabout way to regulate distribution, whereas, if there is production and distribution both in the respective areas where things are required, it is automatically regulated, and there is less chance for fraud, none for speculation. Mass production takes no note of the real requirement of the consumer. If mass production were in itself a virtue, it should be capable of indefinite multiplication. But it can be definitely shown that mass production carries within it its own limitations. If all countries adopted the system of mass production, there would not be a big enough market for their products. Mass production must then come to a stop.

“I do not believe that industrialization is necessary in any case for any country. It is much less so for India. Indeed, I believe that independent India can only discharge her duty towards a groaning world by adopting a simple but ennobled life by developing her thousands of cottages and living at peace

with the world. High thinking is inconsistent with material life, based on high speed imposed on us by Mammon worship. All the graces of life are possible only when we learn the art of living nobly. There may be sensation in living dangerously. We must draw the distinction between living in the face of danger and living dangerously. A man who dares to live alone in a forest infested by wild beasts and wilder men without a gun and with God as his only help, lives in the face of danger. A man who lives perpetually in mid-air and dives to the earth below to the admiration of a gaping world lives dangerously. One is a purposeful, the other a purposeless life

“What is the cause of the present chaos? It is exploitation, I will not say, of the weaker nations by the stronger, but of sister nations by sister nations. Any my fundamental objection to machinery rests on the fact that it is machinery that has enabled these nations to exploit others. Machinery has its place; it has come to stay. But it must not be allowed to displace necessary human labour. An improved plough is a good thing. But if by some chance one man could plough up, by some mechanical invention of his, the whole of the land of India and control all the agricultural produce and if the millions had no other occupation they would starve, and being idle, they would become dunces, as many have already become. There is hourly danger of many more being reduced to that unenviable state. I would welcome every improvement in the cottage machine, but I know that it is criminal to displace hand labour by the introduction of power-driven spindles unless one is at the same time ready to give millions of farmers some other occupation in their homes. What I object is the “craze” for machinery, not machinery as such. The craze is for what they call labour-saving machinery, Men go on “saving labour” till thousands are without work and thrown on the open streets to die of starvation. I want to save time and labour, not for a fraction of mankind, but for all; I want the concentration of wealth, not in the hands of a few, but in the hands of all. Today machinery merely helps a few to ride on the back of millions. The impetus behind it all is not the philanthropy to save labour, but greed. It is against this constitution of things that I am fighting with all my might. It is an alteration in the condition of labour that I want. This mad rush for wealth

must cease, and the labourer must be assured, not only of a living wage, but a daily task that is not a mere drudgery. The machine will, under these conditions, be as much a help to the man working it as to the State, or the man who owns it. The present mad rush will cease, and the labourer will work (as I have said) under attractive and ideal conditions. This is but one of the exceptions I have in mind. The sewing machine had love at its back. The individual is the one supreme consideration. The saving of labour of the individual should be the object, and the honest humanitarian consideration, and not greed, the motive. Replace greed by love, and everything will come right.

"Hand-spinning does not, it is not intended that it should, compete with, in order to displace, any existing type of industry ; it does not aim at withdrawing a single able bodied person ; who can otherwise find a remunerative occupation from his work. The sole claim advanced on its behalf is that it alone offers an immediate, practicable, and permanent solution of that problem of problems that confronts India, viz, the enforced idleness for nearly six months in the year of an overwhelming majority of India's population, owing to lack of a suitable supplementary occupation to agriculture and the chronic starvation of the masses that result therefrom. Little do town-dwellers know how the semi-starved masses of India are slowly sinking to lifelessness. Little do they know that their miserable comfort represents the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter that the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. Little do they realise that the government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away the evidence that the skeletons in many villages present to the marked eye, I have no doubt whatsoever that both England and the town-dwellers of India will have to answer, if there is a God above, for this crime against humanity which is perhaps unequalled in history. I would favour the use of the most elaborate machinery if thereby India's pauperism and resulting idleness be avoided. I have suggested hand-spinning as the only ready means of driving away penury and making famine of work and wealth impossible. The spinning wheel itself is a piece of valuable

machinery, and in my own humble way I have tried to secure improvements in it in keeping with the special conditions of India. I would say that if the village perishes, India will perish too. India will be no more India. Her own mission in the world will get lost. The revival of the village is possible only when it is no more exploited. Industrialization on a mass-scale will necessarily lead to passive or active exploitation of the villagers as the problems of competition and marketing come in. Therefore, we have to concentrate on the village being self-contained, manufacturing mainly for use. Provided this character of the village industry is maintained, there would be no objection to villagers using even the modern machines and tools that they can make and can afford to use. Only they should not be used as a means of exploitation of others."

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, my immediate predecessor has said in the name of Gandhi that machine has displaced man from his employment and thus has made him completely idle and thereby has robbed him of his bread. Another predecessor has said that machine has degraded man into a brute or an unthinking and unfeeling creature. Another predecessor has said that machine has made man an addict to all sorts of bodily enjoyments and thereby has killed the spiritual, moral and religious instinct in him. I do not agree with any of my predecessors. If machine has snatched away much of work from the hands of man there are yet plenty of jobs to be done by man with his hands because they cannot be done by the machine; and therefore, how can you say that machine has robbed man of his daily bread? Then again, how has machine made man an unthinking or unfeeling brute? In spite of all sorts of machine man is still left to do all sorts of humanitarian work, to love his fellowmen, to make all sorts of self-sacrifice for the service of mankind. Who is preventing man from doing any kind of charitable or humanitarian work? Do you mean to say that the capitalists are exploiting the labourers? But how many capitalists are there in the world? And some of them are sometimes donating huge amounts of money for charitable purposes e.g. Ford, Nobel, Fullbright, *Carnegie* and many other multimillionaires have donated millions of dollars or pounds to noble causes like building hospitals, research laboratories,

educational institutions etc. Last of all, I do not believe at all that machine has made man an addict to bodily enjoyments only and has killed altogether the spiritual instinct in him. If it were so, there would not have been still in various parts of the world so many millions of people who are spending their days and nights in the temples, churches, mosques, monasteries and other holy places of worship; so many billions and trillions of people—civilized or uncivilized—would not have attended prayers, would not have spent hours and days in the meditation of God, in the quest of the Invisible. What does it matter to the world if a microscopic minority of the human population who are millionaires and multi-millionaires, indulge in all sorts of bodily enjoyments and never think of God or any kind of spiritual culture?

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	50	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	50	„ „ „ „		
Third Speaker	„	40	„ „ „		
Fourth Speaker	„	65	„ „ „		
Fifth Speaker	„	60			

REVIEW

Out of five speakers, one speaker has done very well although he has not given any of his own arguments but has merely quoted the words of Mahatma Gandhi. The other speakers have not done badly because their arguments are quite practical, sound and convincing. Their only defect is that they have not been able to correlate the two concepts and thereby to contrast them—the concept of man and the concept of machine. The present problem is purely an economic problem, and as such, every body is not competent enough to tackle it

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The present topic for discussion is one of the most important problems of the modern world. It is also one of the stiffest problems, and hence, it is not easy to pass one's judg-

ment on it in five or ten minutes' time which is generally allowed to the candidates who come up for interviews. But the success achieved by most of the speakers, comparatively speaking, is not altogether bad. The proposition, being purely a technical subject, can not be expected to be discussed by every Tom, Dick or Harry.

— — — —

Discussion No. 47

WHICH WOULD YOU PREFER AND WHY—MONOGAMY POLYGAMY OR POLYANDRY?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, the tendency of the modern people in most of the civilized countries is monogamy which means to own one married partner at a time. There are various reasons for it as the following :—

1. Man has started believing in monotheism *i.e.* one god, and not in polytheism or plurality of gods.

2. In the primitive stage, man believed in polytheism ; he used to fancy the presence of a presiding (governing) deity over the sun, the moon and the stars, over every object of nature—the river, the ocean, the lake, the sea, the mountain, the trees etc. because to him every thing of this universe was enveloped in mystery which he could not decipher (explain or understand). In the same way man in the earliest days of human history used to believe in polygamy because he wanted to ‘increase and multiply’ his race as much as he could. Nature prompted him to be polygamous ; otherwise probably the human species would have been long ago extinct on earth as some of the animals have become extinct.

3. Man was polygamous chiefly because in the primitive stage he used to have group marriage, promiscuous marriage or sex-relations, which offered him (particularly, the leader of a clan or a tribe) the opportunity of capturing and owning more than one woman for his wife.

4. In the earlier years, man had not developed so much of the sense of responsibility as he has done these days, and hence, he never cared to count how many wives or children he owned, because he had no other concern with his wives or their children beyond an accidental touch with them.

5. In the beginning of human history, there were more women than men in these parts of the world where man came into existence for the first time. There was not one Adam or one Eve in any part of the world as is mentioned in the Bible.

6. Formerly, man was much more virile than he is now-a-days ; one man was enough for fertilizing several women just as one healthy and strong stud-bull is sufficient for fertilizing several cows !

7. In earlier days, man needed several women for doing all sorts of jobs—attending the children, looking after the cattle, cooking food, collection of fuel, collection of fodder for some of the domestic animals e.g. horses, cows, mules, donkeys etc.

8. Man was not sentimental at all ; he cared little for his wives or children ; he was not even their protector.

9. Women too did not care for man's love or affection ; they cared more for fertilization, and sometimes for the protection of their children as of their own selves. Women were comparatively weaker than men in earlier days.

Personally, I am in favour of polygamy, like our ancestors, although I belong to the twentieth century, and possess not more than one wife. Our ancestors used to believe in polygamy because they needed it for the maintenance of the joint-family. The duties and responsibilities of the joint family were involved mostly in the women of the family who were either daughters or daughters-in-law or wives i.e. who played the role of mothers to all other junior members. As a matter of fact, women were the best to perform all household duties such as separating the husk from the rice or the wheat ; looking after the cows and buffalos, feeding them at home and milching them ; washing the clothes of the children as well as of some of their elders and of their own too ; cleaning the kitchen

utensils, cooking food for the whole family,—which was the most important duty of the household in those days as the most important duty now-a-days is to look after the family clothes, to arrange the furniture in the house, to dust and clean them because now-a-days people pay much greater attention to clothes than to food !

I am in favour of polygamy these days for economy as well as for preventing frequent divorce and remarriage. What is the good of changing partners at intervals of five or eight years ? It is better to have as many wives as one can afford in the very beginning. The Chinese people even these days have ordinarily more than half a dozen wives, not because they are richer than the Indian people but because they have a better sense of economy than the Indians—they believe in earning through their women as well as through their children, and not merely in feeding them and adding to their own burden. Our ancient Hindu forefathers followed the policy of the Chinese but now-a-days we are following the example of the Europeans and the Americans who divorce and remarry every morning adding to the number of the divorces who are regarded as 'rejected' or 'damaged' goods ! I am also not in favour of "rejected" or "damaged" goods. The argument of the modern Europeans and Americans is "what is the good of keeping cows at home if you can get milk from the *bazaar* ?" But divorcing and remarrying do not mean getting milk from the *bazaar* ; public prostitution may mean that although now-a-days public prostitution has become an illegal trade in almost all the civilized countries except in India. That is why, it is said that public prostitution is maintaining monogamy in India. But as soon as public prostitution disappears from our country, polygamy will reappear in the form of frequent divorce and remarriage, as it has reappeared in Europe and America.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, I am in favour of polyandry although polyandry has practically died out in the modern world particularly from the civilized countries. In ancient India polyandry was popular for some centuries when the male population was much larger than the female population. In the *Mahabharat*, the greatest epic of the Hindus, it is mentioned

that Draupadi had five husbands (five Pandava brothers) who used to visit her by turns. In the days of *Mahabharat* the male population of India must have exceeded the female population enormously just as during certain epochs of Indian history female population far exceeded the male population, and hence, polygamy was in vogue. Even now-a-days, in some parts of South India, particularly, in Coorg and Mysore, polyandry is still in vogue atleast in the rural areas, chiefly because of the old custom and not so much due to the growth of male population in these areas. There are some parts of our country in which women outnumber men *e.g.* in Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, and in most parts of South India, while in the Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana men outnumber women; and therefore, I would personally recommend polyandry in those states where the male population far exceeds the female population, and I would recommend polygamy with equal reasons in those States where the female population far exceeds the male population.

Then again, polyandry was popular in those epochs or ages and also in those countries when and where the matriarchal family system was prevalent. Considering the advancement and progress of women in the modern world and considering also their aggressive attitude, polyandry is very likely to come into fashion again; but that would depend upon the strength of the female population in a particular country. In my opinion, U.S.A. will take the lead in this direction because in U.S.A. the female folk is out-numbering the male folk and also becoming quite aggressive in every field in the sense that women are proving their superiority over men in all kinds of technical and non-technical work, in civil as well as in military services. Next to U.S.A., polyandry is likely to come into fashion in France, much earlier than in any other European countries. So far Britain is concerned, she is likely to have polygamy in the nearest future because her female population is far exceeding her male population. As for other countries of Europe, things will go on as usual but in Russia, which is half a European country and half an Asiatic country, there will be sooner or later neither polygamy nor polyandry nor even monogamy because marriage and children will be the responsibilities of the State as it was three decades ago when the

companionate system of marriage was being experimented but was ultimately given up. If Communism survives at all, which I doubt very much, there will be no marriage in any of the Communist countries but there will be some kind of sex-relations between men and women and the progeny produced by such relations would be the property and responsibility of the State.

Personally, I would prefer polyandry for the following reasons :—

1. We are already fed up with monogamy and polygamy; we are also fed up with divorce and remarriage.

2. In our country due to the system of polygamy, the number of widows has been multiplying. Biologically speaking, one woman can manage half a dozen men by turns; but one man can not manage more than one woman altogether, because the vitality of man is much lower than that of woman !

3. Divorce or changing partners has an adverse effect upon the children because all children have a definite aversion for their step-fathers or step-mothers !

4. Statistically it has been found out all over the world that woman invariably survives man in ninety nine cases out of a hundred for the simple reason that woman has got much greater vitality than man.

5. Polyandry is preferable to polygamy for one important consideration, namely, for strengthening the male folk and thereby strengthening the nation against all kinds of aggression.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I am, however, strongly in favour of monogamy because the very idea of polygamy and polyandry is repugnant to me. I am giving you the following arguments in favour of monogamy :—

1. Any other form of marriage except monogamy is no marriage at all but a mere sex-relation which can not be distinguished from the mating of animals !

2. Monogamy is the only system of marriage prevalent

in the civilized countries whereas polygamy and polyandry are popular among the uncivilized countries.

3 The human world is proceeding gradually from polytheism to monotheism, from the joint-family system to the single-family system, from collectivism to individualism from diversity to unity.

4. Monogamy alone can maintain domestic unity, domestic harmony, domestic love and attachment. How can one man love several wives or how can one woman love several husbands ? It comes to prostitution on both sides ! In the case of polygamous marriage, it is the man who plays the patron of several prostitutes, while in the case of polyandrous marriage, it is the woman who plays the prostitute to her several visitors or patrons ! But in the case of monogamy, man is the real husband and woman is the real wife, and their children are the permanent ties of love and loyalty between the husband and the wife

5. In my opinion, in monogamous marriage, there should be no divorce and no remarriage ; otherwise the evils of polygamy and polyandry will come back to it.

6. Plato believed sincerely that man is one half, while woman is the other half so that after their marriage they become one whole. That should be the true ideal of monogamous marriage. The Hindus too used to regard marriage as a spiritual union but they vitiated the noble idea by encouraging polygamy and polyandry.

7 The human family was originally built up on monogamy but now that the world is having a tendency to polygamy and polyandry, the family is going to pieces ! The Muslims still believe in keeping four wives at a times, the Hindus too have been believing for ages in keeping an unlimited number of wives, while the Christians—modern or ancient—believe in frequent divorce and remarriage. How can such a tendency maintain the sanctity of the marital tie or the love and peace in the family ? I am, therefore, strictly in favour of monogamy and at the same time dead against divorce and remarriage.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I have very carefully listened to the arguments of all the foregoing speakers ; but I do not know why, I can not subscribe to any of their views because every one of them seems to be strongly prejudiced against some form of marriage or other. But I would like to treat marriage absolutely from no sentimental point of view but from the most practical point of view and under the contest of the changing times or circumstances I would never say that monogamy is the best system of marriage or that polygamy or polyandry is a bad system, or even that all the three systems are equally bad. Like the Communist, although I am not a Communist, I am in favour of no marriage at all but I believe only in promiscuous sex relations. Do not think for a moment that I am a debauch or that I want to tarnish the sacred tie of marriage in any sense. My real aim is that marriage should not be treated as more than temporary bodily relationship as it has been proved from time to time in all cases of human marriage. If the State can be the custodian of all other assets of life, why should it not be the custodian of human marriage and its progeny also ? And if the State becomes the custodian of our marriage it should lay down certain rules for communion between men and women so that no diseased or disabled or crippled person may have any share in such a communion because the aim of every country should be to bring out healthy children and to make the nation healthy and strong. The State should provide for the education of the children, and so far their parents are concerned, children will never come to know them, and the parents shall be provided with proper employments by the State. That is exactly what Plato had suggested two thousand years ago !

There should be no other method of selection for partnership between man and woman except their physical and mental fitness. There shall be no distinction between the high and the low, between the cultured and the uncultured, between the rich and the poor so far this communion between men and women is concerned. If all distinctions are levelled to the ground at the time of communion, there shall be no quarrel at any time of the future on any plea or ground between the citizens of any State in the world wherever this sort of "free marriage" is introduced.

Fifth Speaker

Gentlemen, what my preceding speaker has said is pure blasphemy; and it can never be recommended except for the animals and the beasts in the jungles. The very idea of "free marriage" is monstrous. The human world is advancing still in light and culture. How can it go back to barbarism or animalism again? I am not in favour of any other system of marriage—polygamy or polyandry—than monogamy, which is, in my eyes, an ideal system. Monogamy is the ideal system of marriage provided it does not admit of divorce or remarriage. The following are the arguments in favour of monogamy which, I am sure, are perfectly in harmony with the health of the body and the soul :—

1. Monogamy gives stability to the family and no indiscipline to society.
2. Monogamy strengthens the tie of love and affection between parents and children and also between brothers and sisters.
3. Monogamy helps the concentration of the mind of both man and woman to the struggle for existence and to all other pursuits of life which advance the cause of human progress.
4. Monogamy is a reliable check upon the growth of population, because one man and one woman can not very much "increase and multiply" It is because of monogamous marriage that the population of Europe and America is not at all multiplying but rather dwindling whereas the population of China and India has been multiplying by leaps and bounds because of their practice of polygamy.
5. Polygamy is bound to degenerate the race as it has done in India and also in China.
6. In the modern world when the struggle for existence is so hard and acute, there is no escape from monogamy unless you want to invite poverty and misery which India and China both have already invited by their polygamous marriage.
7. Polyandry has disappeared from the civilized or pro-

gressive world for ever, and it is not likely to return unless woman becomes extinct or man becomes unduly strong numerically.

8. In the beginning of the human race, there was only one Eve for one Adam, and then, the earth was really a paradise—a Garden of Eden! But now, it has become an *inferno* (hell) because of the various systems of marriage—polygamy, polyandry, monogamy, group marriage, free marriage, companionate marriage and so many other forms of marriage.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	75	out	of	100	marks
Second Speaker	"	75	"	"	"	"
Third Speaker	"	60	"	"	"	"
Fourth Speaker	"	30	"	"	"	"
Fifth Speaker	"	60	"	"	"	"

REVIEW

Except one speaker all other speakers have done very well. It seems, the speakers were well-informed on the subject. Their arguments are sometimes original and interesting. The topic for discussion is a very old subject but it has been given a new colour by some of the speakers who on that account deserve some amount of credit.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

It is really surprising how modern youths of our country could carry on the discussion on such an old subject which is not at all controversial in any sense and yet which has been given a controversial colour by the speakers who, therefore, deserve some amount of credit.

Discussion No. 48

WHO IS WISER—AGE OR YOUTH ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, there is an eternal conflict between youth and age ; but why ? Because none of the two will ever admit its own faults to the other, because both of them are unduly fond of self-flattery, because sometimes in the struggle for existence they have to come together to work in competition, because age is stiff and rigid, orthodox and conservative, while youth unduly liberal or revolutionary. It is, therefore, very difficult to say who is wiser ; and although we are all young people assembled here yet I would always vote for age and declare openly that age is wiser than youth. I am giving you the following arguments in defence of age :—

1. Age means those who are advanced in years, and who are therefore experienced in life. An experienced person is surely wiser than an inexperienced person because it is always by experience that we grow wiser day by day. You can not expect a boy of twelve to have the same experience as an old man of sixty, and hence, a boy of that age must be much less wise than a man of that age.

2. Besides, the human brain or the human intellect grows by degrees from day to day till it attains its full maturity at forty or forty-five; but there are certain modern psychologists who say that the human brain grows on developing till one's death ; and hence, the most aged person is the wisest person.

3. Most of the elderly people are patient, deliberate, considerate, calculating while most of the young people (youths) are impatient, impulsive, hasty, inconsiderate and even reckless and thoughtless.

4 Those who are advanced in years develop their powers of foresight and insight while those who are comparatively young lack both the qualities, and hence, how can they be wise ?

5. Youths can never solve any knotty problem ; they are always helpless at a crisis ; but the older people can solve many of the most difficult problems with much greater ease than youths can possibly do

6 All over the world, the elderly people hold responsible positions in every sphere, and why ? Because they have a much greater sense of responsibility than the youths.

7 Youths are fond of revolutionary changes because they always run after the new whether the new is better than the old or not. But the older people think thrice before they jump at the new because they judge at every-step the comparative values of the old and the new. The older people are unjustly called, on that account, conservative, orthodox, rigid and obstinate but such conservatism or orthodoxy is often for the good of mankind.

8 The older people are always serious and sedate and very seldom fickle-hearted or fickle-minded but youths are mostly fickle-hearted and fickle-mind ; and that is why, most people have regards for the elderly people and none for the younger generations.

9. Most of the elderly people have got much of self-confidence but the youths have only pride and vanity about them.

10 The elderly people are never frivolous ; they never fritter away their energy on useless pursuits ; but the youths can do nothing except wasting their time and energy on fruitless things.

11. All the great tasks have been performed by age and not by youth ; and that is why, age is remembered in history while youth has no place in history or in the memory of mankind.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker has throughout made mis-statements of facts I wonder how a youngman like him can be so unusually fond of age. I am sure he has already

grown old inspite of his young age, and in my opinion, he is the unfittest person to be entrusted with a Commission in the Armed Forces however otherwise he may be qualified. I am going to refute every one of his arguments, one by one, serially so that you may be able to judge correctly who is right and who is wrong.

1. My preceding speaker says that an experienced person is surely wiser than an inexperienced person because it is always by experience that we grow wiser day by day. This is not correct in my opinion because there are thousands of persons who are not a whit benefitted by experience and who. therefore grow none the wiser. One may be one hundred years old and may also have thousands of various kinds of experience and yet one may remain a fool all his life. An old donkey cannot be beaten into a horse or a horse cannot be beaten into a man if the faculty of intelligence or commonsense be missing !

2 My preceding speaker says that the human brain or the human intellect grows by degrees from day to day till it attains its full maturity at a certain stage of advanced years ; but that is also a wrong theory. In the first instance, there is no question of any development of the brains if there is no brain at all ; and besides, most of the medical authorities certify that the human brain comes to a dead stop after certain years, and then, it begins to decline. That is why, people rightly say that old age is second childhood or in other words, an old man is a fool !

3. It is absolutely wrong to say that most of the old people are patient, calculating, considerate while most of the young people are impatient, impulsive, hasty, inconsiderate and even reckless. Most of the old men, in my opinion, are timid and cowardly, and that is why, they are hesitating and wavering, and not at all deliberate or considerate in any sense ; they fumble in the dark, they are not sure of their judgment or understanding, and that is why, they can never take any quick decision. The young people are not at all hasty or reckless or impulsive but they are most enthusiastic, bold and adventurous, and that is why, they appear to be hasty and reckless.

4. It seems to be a wonderful piece of logic when my

predecessor says that those who are advanced in years develop their powers of foresight and insight while those who are comparatively young lack both the qualities, and hence, how can they be wise? Can any physician or psychologist certify that the powers of insight and foresight develop with the advance of years or that these two faculties are completely missing in the younger people? All authorities say that foresight and insight are faculties which are born with some persons while others are not endowed at all with any of them; and therefore, age has nothing to do with their presence or development.

5. It is absolutely wrong to say that it is only age that can solve the knotty problems of life while youth cannot solve any of them. The solution of a problem depends upon the intelligence of a person and also upon certain circumstances, and not upon age.

6. All over the world undoubtedly the older people hold responsible positions in every sphere, not because they have any greater sense of responsibility than the young people but because the old people do not allow the young people to occupy any seat of responsibility; the old people are so jealous and greedy of power that they want to retain all the power in their own hands till their death. Then again, there are many instances in every part of the world in which the young people also hold responsible positions e.g. late Mr. J. F. Kennedy, President of U. S. A.; President Nasser of Egypt; Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, and many others.

7. Then again, my preceding speaker has said that youths always run after the new without considering whether it is good or bad but the old people never jump at the new, because they know that old wine is always sweeter than new wine. I would like to say in reply that youth runs after the new because youth is in full bloom, and naturally, it loves the radiant, the glorious, the beautiful, while age loves the old because age has no vitality, no hope, no future, nothing of the kind, and hence, age always dotes on the old. Further, my predecessor has said that the old people are not orthodox or conservative or rigid or obstinate; but who is then so? Not surely youth? In old age, the backbone actually becomes stiff and the brain too gets dry; and that

is why, old people are conservative and orthodox, and they want to stick to the eighteenth century or much earlier views and ideas that have been completely out-moded and made obsolete.

8 The old people are not at all sedate or grave or serious but they appear to be so simply because they put on airs of seriousness in order to look important and responsible or because they have lost all the humour of life unlike the young people who are brimming with life, and hence, who appear to be fickle and frivolous which they really are not.

9. It is not at all true that most of the elderly people have much of self-confidence while younger people have none of it except pride and vanity. It is not youth but age which is proud and vain because age never admits its faults nor does it repent for it at all but youth is always frank about its faults and also asks for forgiveness.

10. It is also absolutely wrong to say that old people never waste their time or energy in frivolous pursuits while the young people alone waste their time and life on useless things. The old people are far more frivolous than the young people, because they are extremely fond of drinking, gambling and enjoying young women !

11. It is a downright lie when my honourable predecessor says that all the great tasks have been performed or accomplished by age and not by youth ; on the contrary, all resolutions, all reformatations, all wars have been launched and conducted by youth and not by age.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, I have listened to the arguments of the two preceding speakers both for and against the proposition, and I must confess frankly, I am on the side of age and not of youth although I am a young man. All the world over, age is venerated, and why? Because age has real wisdom, real foresight and insight, sound judgment, and on top of all, it is the old people who possess every sense of responsibility and who are not likely to be carried off their feet by every gust of wind, by every revolutionary theory, by every impulsive thought as the young people are generally influenced. Look at the

President, the Prime Minister, the Governors, the Cabinet Ministers, the members of the Parliament in any country, and you will find that every one of them has been most successfully and competently fulfilling his function, and even some of them are retained in their service beyond their terms of tenure simply because they are indispensable. Even some of the Heads of the armed forces in most of the countries are pretty old, and yet they are extended in their tenure of service simply because of their competency. Who would keep a person in an important seat of office if he is not competent or serviceable? Our Nehru ruled over India as the Prime Minister for full eighteen years which is a unique record in the history of administration. Churchill ruled over England for full four terms as the Prime Minister, and the world knows how he won the last World War against Hitler in 1945. Gladstone was made the Prime Minister of England four times which is also unique in the history of England. Even Mao Tse-tung who is now seventy-four years old is ruling over China for the last three decades guiding all civil and military affairs, and yet China wants him further for as many years as he can live! So, we find that it is always the older people who are honoured, respected and given highest position everywhere. Our President Radhakrishnan is seventy six years old, and yet India wants that he should continue to be the President of the union as long as he lives. Dr. Rajendra Prasad was also an old man, and yet he was President of the Indian Union for ten years when unfortunately his life was cut short. Most of the Governors and Chief Ministers of the various States of our country are not less than sixty years of age. Do you mean to say that our country is running short of capable youngmen? No. But the point is that however brilliant youngmen may be, they cannot equal or surpass their elders who are far more capable than they are.

Then again, in all responsible activities or undertakings, it is the older people who guide the young, who advise the young, and who serve as "the law and impulse" to the young. The young people too do not feel confident, do not feel inspired or enthusiastic about any important mission unless the old people are at their back. It is absolutely a wrong idea that the old people are orthodox, conservative, rigid, stiff-necked. They undoubtedly appear to be so because their wisdom does not

allow them to be unduly drastic or changeable or revolutionary as the young people mostly are because the young people lack experience, lack foresight, lack ripe judgment, and lack practically every thing which is required for taking a correct decision in any important affair. The old people seldom commit any error whereas the younger people commit errors at every step of their action.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I am always for the young, and I sincerely believe that the young people are far more capable and far more noble and generous at heart in all affairs, while the old people are invariably unsympathetic, prejudiced and even cruel to the last degree because their heart has been atrophied just as their body has been decayed and crippled ; and as regards the brains, the old people deserve to be called old fools ! It is only the old people who would praise the old but the young people would never praise them unless they are tricked or forced !

I am for the young because it is the young alone who pioneer all undertakings of adventure, courage and daring ; because it is young alone who possess the dash, the energy, the enthusiasm, the spirit for creating revolutions, for leading mankind from darkness to light, from idleness to activity, from stagnation and death to a new life or a new order of things ; because it is the young alone all over the world who have risked their lives in order to achieve all kinds of noble deeds. I am for the young because the young alone are noble, generous, self-sacrificing, compromising and forgiving while the old, on the other hand, are most unforgiving, mean, selfish, wicked and vindictive. Personally, I can never believe that the old are fit or capable in any way ; they are undoubtedly jealous of power, and like a bull-dog, they want to stick to it ; they love life so much, as they love power and wealth, that they are not ready to part with any of them unless and until they breathe their last.

It is a fact, which nobody can deny, that the old are decayed and decaying still, and they are worth nothing unless the young are with them, unless the young prop them up. All over the world, it is not the old but it is the young who out of their pity support the old because they know that the old will

not live long, and hence, they are allowed to hold on certain seats of office which they could never hold independently of the young. It is the young who have made the old venerable, made them appear as wise, capable and worthy of importance and responsibility ; otherwise the old are not worth much or anything at all. The old are sans eyes, sans brains, sans everything, and yet the foolish world says that the old are wiser and more capable than the young !

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	60	out of 100 marks
Second Speaker	„	70	„ „ „ „
Third Speaker	„	70	„ „ „ „
Fourth Speaker	„	55	„ „

REVIEW

Out of the four speakers, three speakers have done exceptionally well. Three of the speakers have analysed youth and age quite correctly although from two opposite angles ; and hence, they deserve credit for their analysis. The subject for discussion is one of the oldest problems because there seems to be an eternal strife between youth and age which can never be made up for the simple reason that youth and age belong to two opposite poles !

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board has merely to congratulate the speakers for their excellent performance. But it is rather unfortunate that out of eight candidates for interview, only four have taken part in the discussion. It seems, many of the young people are not prepared to criticise the old while others are not ready to shower self-praise on themselves !

— — — —

Discussion No. 49

WHICH DRESS SHOULD WE FOLLOW—INDIAN OR ENGLISH? AND WHY?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, can any one of you tell me which exactly is the Indian dress? Some people say that the Indian dress consists of *dhoti* and *kamiz* (shirt), while others say that it consists of *kurta* and *pyjama*; a few others say that it consists of shirt or coat and *lungi*; there are others who say that the Indian dress consists of *kurta* and *lungi*. Then again, there are so many kinds of pyjamas, so many varieties of shirt and *kurta*, and so many kinds of coat too! We have got to consider also the head-dress which the Punjabees, the people of Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, the people of Uttar Pradesh and a few other States wear. Chiefly, there are two kinds of the head dress—the cap and the turban; but then, the turbans of the Punjabees and the Rajasthan people are slightly different from each other just as their *pyjamas* are also different. The South Indians, the Bengalees, the Beharis and the Oryas do not have their head dress at all. Now, there is some amount of difference between the dress of the Muslims and that of the Hindus, and this difference lies in the cut and the style of their shirts or *kurtas* or *pyjamas* or turbans or caps. We have got to consider also the Indian dress for women because our women are now-a-days taking part in all kinds of work along with our men, and we will have to find out which particular dress would be most suitable for them. Indian women generally put on saree and blouse; a few of them put on *salwar* and *kamiz*. The women of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Assam, Uttar Pradesh, South

India and practically all other States except the Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir wear *saree* and blouse. It is only the Muslim women who mostly prefer *salwar* and *kamiz*. So, we see that *saree* and blouse form practically the universal female dress of our country, while a minority of our women wear *salwar* and *kamiz*.

Personally speaking, *pyjama* and *kurta* for the body and turban for the head dress are probably the most suitable male dress for our country, while *salwar* and *kamiz* seem to be the best dress for our women. *Dhoti*, in my opinion, is unduly loose, and hence, unmanageable particularly for any kind of outdoor life or duty. *Dhoti* is not only loose but also can be easily dislodged from the body putting the wearer to the risk of being nude at any moment ! *Dhoti* is otherwise a very comfortable wear particularly at home but a very unmanageable dress for outdoor life. A *dhoti* is a very long affair, while a *lungi* is practically one quarter of a *dhoti*, and yet when it is worn, it runs a much greater risk of nudity than a *dhoti* because of its manner of wearing. The South Indians are extremely fond of the *lungi* while the Bengalees are equally fond of the *dhoti*. The *dhoti* lends a leisurely look to the wearer while the *lungi* gives a look of vulgarity and indecency particularly in the eyes of modern women. The *pyjama* for men while the *salwar* for women are the best dress because they give a look of decency to the wearer. The *salwar* provides sufficient security to young women against any surprise attack on their modesty. The Panjabee women put on *salwar* probably because originally during the days of Raja Ranjit Singh, they used to take part in much of outdoor duties while helping their male folk in fighting against the Britishers. The *salwar* and the *kamiz* are, therefore, the best costume for any kind of indoor and outdoor work, and they also lend a peculiar charm to the feminine body by bringing into view (ofcourse under cover !) all the enviable limbs of a young woman ! The tight-fitting *salwar* and *kamiz* which are now-a-days being worn specially by the college and university girls are exquisitely charming although the lightness of the garment is going to extremes making the wearer uncomfortable particularly when getting into or stepping out of a vehicle ! It becomes a sight for the gods when college or university girls wearing such tight-fitting *salwar* and *kamiz* have to be helped in and out by the vehicle drivers. We know of

several cases of the wearers of such tight-fitting garments falling down on the public thoroughfares and receiving bruises and other severe wounds on their delicate limbs ! Otherwise *salwar* and *kamiz*, in my eyes as well as in the eyes of all, should appear as an ideal dress for women, not only in India but all over the world.

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, although I am a *pucca* Indian yet I would prefer the English costume to the Indian dress for men as well as women for the following reasons :—

1. The full English costume may be slightly complicated but the type of it, which is worn generally by the working class whether in the offices or in the workshops or in the factories, is a very simple dress. It consists of only pant and shirt or half pant and shirt. In this dress you can run about anywhere and everywhere, sit comfortably anywhere and everywhere, work with tools in a workshop or in the open field ; in this simple dress you can play any kind of games and also fight with your enemy whenever he wants to make a surprise attack on you.

2. But if you put on *dhoti* or *lungi*, your movement becomes extremely restricted, and you feel at every step sufficiently encumbered not to be able to do any job smartly or quickly. There is something in the *dhoti* and the *lungi* which makes one feel awkward particularly when others are putting on pant and shirt or *pyjama* and *kamiz*. You feel awkward because you do not feel so free about the movement of your limbs without the risk of being made naked in broad daylight and before the eyes of others ! This is the greatest disadvantage of the *dhoti* as well as of the *saree* because in a *saree*, a young woman is as defenceless as being in nakedness !

3. The English costume is one of the most decent and also the smartest costumes in the world, and that is why, probably, it is being worn by all nationalities of the world. You please let me know which nationality in the world does not use the English dress ; you can not mention any. Even the Chinese and the Africans put on the English dress because they find it so convenient, so smart, so respectable and also simple. We Indians have been crying against the English people, against

their language, against their culture and ways of life, but we are still putting on their dress with pride which they left behind while they quitted our land ! It is particularly the so-called champions of Hindi who are fond of the English dress, the English language, English culture, English food and drink, English ways of life, and possibly the English Jack boot !

4. The English dress (not the full dress) is not at all costly, and it is also more durable than many other costumes in the world. So far the people of India are concerned, the English dress is within their means because a pant and a shirt do not cost much, and they can last atleast for three or four years whereas a *dhobi* and a *kamiz* or *kurta* being very thin or of delicate fabrics can not last beyond one year if the *dhobi* (washerman) does not ruin them earlier.

5. The English dress for women is much simpler. A mere frock and an underwear cost much less than a *salwar* and a *kamiz* or a saree and a blouse. The frock is such a convenient dress for all kinds of indoor and outdoor work. When you clean utensils or cook food or wash clothes, you have to put on an apron (an outer cover) for the protection of your frock.

6. The full English dress lends a personality to the man who wears it. You judge and compare a man in *dhobi* or in *pyjama* or in *lungi* with a man in trousers, and see for yourself the marked difference between the two. The man in trousers would look like a master while the man in *dhobi* would look like a servant ! That is why, probably, most of the Indians are still wearing the English dress in order to lend some additional personality to themselves !

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, it is a disgrace for any people in the world to use any foreign dress instead of their native dress. It is equally a disgrace to make any foreign language the national language of a country. But there is a world of difference between the value of a dress and the value of a language. Dress is merely an outer cover for the body, and it is used only for bodily comfort, convenience and protection; it has no other value beyond that. But a language is the very soul of a people; it is not merely a means of expression; it is the foundation of

culture and all kinds of development of the human race through art, literature, philosophy, science, industries and through all kinds of trade and occupation. The English language is a foreign language for India, and yet it has got to be cultivated by us because English is the greatest international language in the world, because English is the doors and the windows through which the flood of light and culture of the whole human race is available. But the English dress is not like that; it has no value except from the point of view of convenience, smartness and economy; any native dress of any country can be as convenient, as smart and as economic as the English dress. If India wants to use the English dress for any such extraneous purpose, she can do so without any prejudice to any of her vital interests. But she can not trifle with the English language in the same manner because if she discards the English language at this stage of her national development, she would be thrown back into her dark ages from which she will never be able to rise again. Of course, side by side with the English language, we should cultivate and develop our national language *i. e.* Hindi, and it is only then, there will be uniformity in our national progress. I am personally strongly in favour of the English language but not of the English dress. The arguments which have been put forward so far in favour of the English dress are not defensible. In my opinion, we must stick to our native dress however decent, cheap and convenient the English dress may appear to be. The dress, although it is an outward appendage has some deep-acting effect upon the mind. If we do not use our native dress—whichever it may be—we shall feel sooner or later a kind of hatred not only for our native dress but for everything else of our country—our food and drink, our ways of life and even our culture—with the result that we shall be slowly and gradually denationalised as we have been much denationalised by the English rule for about two hundred years. Any foreign dress in any country is bound to develop a kind of inferiority complex in the people who use the foreign dress. Have we not started thinking that our native dress is inferior to the English dress, that our national language is inferior to the English language, that our food and drink, our ways of life, and even our culture are all inferior to all that is English? This particular danger of denationalisation is facing us these

days, and we must take immediate steps to remove it by discarding the English dress immediately and by improving or developing the Hindi language as soon as possible.

When I recollect the face of Mahatma Gandhi and when I think of his dress, food and drink and ways of life, I feel ashamed of any countrymen how quickly they have all forgotten him and also his great ideals. Gandhi was a true nationalist, a genuine patriot, and that is why, he never felt ashamed of his loin cloth, of the Hindi language, of the food and drink which more than five hundred million of his country use daily. Gandhi was not like other congressmen who take pride in speaking English, in putting on the English dress, and in following the English ways of life.

I am, therefore, strongly against the English dress for the use of my countrymen, whatever may be their plea or justification or argument. When from the beginning of Indian history we have been using our own dress why should we change it for the English dress. Our native dress like our native language (Hindi) will help the integration of our nation which consists of so many races. If we do not use our native dress, slowly and gradually, we shall forget our own culture and everything as some of the English-educated people in India have already forgotten their own ancestral culture. What will happen to us in the long run if this sort of denationalisation goes on? We shall be neither fish nor fowl!

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, I do not seem to follow why should we have any prejudice against the English dress when particularly it has been adopted by most of the countries in the world. Why should we raise the question of nationalism in connection with dress, food and drink or language? Look at Russia and U.S.A. Both the countries have adopted the English language as well as the English dress although they have in them all the races of the world—of the East and the West. Americans and Russians are not only liberal but also wise in adopting the English dress and the English language by doing which they have made such rapid advances in science, industries, technology, and practically in all fields. Russians and

Americans do not seem to have any prejudice against any people in the world because they want to imbibe all the good qualities of all peoples of the world. This catholic outlook on men and things has made them now-a-days the most progressive, the most prosperous and the most powerful people in the world.

I do not seem to understand what harm there can be if we use the English dress. Shall we be English people by merely putting on their dress? Even if we become, what is the harm? Don't you think that the English people like their dress and manners are the best people in the world? They were the pioneers in the field of art, literature, science and industries, and it is from them that the East and the West have learnt about art and literature, science and industries. Japan was the wisest country in the Far East who imbibed the true English spirit, and that is why, she is far more advanced in science and industries than even America. It was our fortune that we came in touch with the English people, and however much they might have exploited us, they have taught us practically everything whatever we claim to have known till today. It would be most ungrateful on our part if we entertain any kind of prejudice against the English people, the English manners or even English dress. And besides, what has dress to do with the good or bad qualities of a people? The English people might have been our exploiters, they might have held us in bondage for nearly two centuries; but what has their dress got to do with their exploitation or with our bondage? I am afraid, some of the speakers have been unjust and wrong in their arguments against the English dress, and therefore, I am sure, none of you will be influenced by such speakers and their arguments. We are now living in a world which is trying to draw itself closer to all; India is a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, and hence, it is all the more necessary that we should adopt the English dress and the English language for the reasons I have already put forward.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	75	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	60	„	„	„
Third Speaker	„	75	„	„	„
Fourth Speaker	„	60	„	„	„

REVIEW

All the speakers have done fairly well. It is rather striking and also interesting to note some of the curious arguments which have been put forward for or against Indian and English dress. The same problem was raised in our country soon after our attainment of political independence, but the solution suggested by our Government was not satisfactory.

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board is pleased to note that the performance of each of the speakers has been quite satisfactory, and the discussion has been most interesting.

Discussion No. 50

SHOULD GENERAL EDUCATION BE ALTOGETHER SCRAPPED ?

First Speaker

Gentlemen, first of all, let us try to understand what general education really means, and it is only then, we shall be able to judge whether or not general education should be altogether scrapped in our country. Most of us mean by general education merely the study of some language or literature, history or geography, philosophy, economics, Psychology, politics, and a little bit of arithmetic. In ancient Rome and Greece, general education meant the study of mere literature and philosophy and nothing else, which used to be known as humanities or polite scholarship or learning. In ancient India, general education possibly meant the study of the scriptures or philosophy because scriptures contained nothing but philosophy. In ancient Greece or Rome there was no question of any study of the scriptures because in those early days, no particular religion came into existence as Christianity came into existence in Europe long afterwards. But in ancient India, the Hindu religion, which is embedded in the *Vedas* and the *Upanisads*, is said to be as old as the world or rather as old as the human race, and consequently, Hindu religion or Hindu scriptures or Hindu philosophy is supposed to be the most ancient storehouse of human knowledge in the whole world ; and this knowledge could be acquired only through the medium of Sanskrit which is much older than the Greek or the Latin languages. In the ancient world either in Europe or in India there was no question of any science but the great historians say that in India there was a lot of cultivation of

Mathematics and Astronomy, both of which are now-a-days considered as the most important sciences in the world. But then, there was a lapse of science in India for several succeeding centuries till the advent of the British rule in our country, and it was the Britishers who taught us a little bit of science but nothing of industries or technology. Even in England, science came into existence just three centuries ago, and it was through England that science spread all over Europe, America and most of the countries in the Far East. But science, even one hundred years ago, meant nothing more than Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry, atleast in our country; but soon afterwards, it spread out its branches in so many directions, and now-a-days even the study of art and literature has been converted into scientific studies, such as mental science (Psychology), moral science (Ethics), political science (politics), political economy (a scientific study of politics and economics), Phonetics (the science of pronunciation in language), Philology (science of language), Anthropology (science of human origin), Archaeology (science of historical remains), Psychiatry (medical treatment of mental diseases), etc. So, it is difficult to say now-a-days, which of the branches of study is not a scientific study, and therefore, it is still more difficult to distinguish general education from scientific education. Any how, for our understanding at this moment let us take general education as non-scientific education. Well, I am sure, nobody in the present century can be in favour of general education only because the present century is essentially an age of science. Even if you keep sitting at home you will feel the impact of science in all your household articles and household ways e.g. electric lights electric fans, electric stove, electric cooler, electric heater, electric iron, even electric washing, shaving and bathing! And when you go out of your home, you have to board some automatic vehicle—a car or a bus or a scooter or anything else; you have to do your shopping by putting some money into the slots at the various shops, and the articles you want to have will come straight to your hand! If you want to send any message to any body within the city, you will have to ring him up on the public telephone; and if you want to send your message to some distant place, you can use the telephone, the telegraph, the wireless etc. If there be a fire in your own house, you can put out the fire by using some fire-extinguisher and then ring

up also the fire-brigade of the municipal corporation of your city. That is how we are all made to feel the impact of science more or less in every part of the world ; and therefore, how can anybody say that we should rest satisfied with general education (non-scientific) only ? How can I vote for general education ? I would better recommend the scrapping (abolition) of such education !

Second Speaker

Gentlemen, my preceding speaker seems to forget the trunk of a tree for the sake of its branches or the root of a tree for the sake of its trunk, branches, leaves etc. May I ask my honourable friend how science did come into existence ? Did it come out of nothing just as an atheist (disbeliever in God) thinks that the universe come out of nothing or that it was self-created ! But science did not come out of nothing—it came out of the brains which were developed by general education. Should I give you the following arguments in support of my view *i.e.* we can never afford to scrap general education at any stage of human history but we can afford to scrap our scientific education just as we actually went without it when science did not come into existence :—

1. Every child or adult has to learn his mother-tongue and cultivate it as far as possible in order to express his thoughts feelings, ideas, views etc , otherwise he can not live in society or even in the family. A man without any power or instrument of expression would have to live like birds and beasts, who probably have no other means of communication except certain gestures and movements of the body. Merely learning the mother tongue for the sake of communicating oneself to others will not do ; one has got to study also the literature in that language (mother tongue) because he will not be able to learn anything about the history or geography, the character or psychology of the people of his country who speak the same language. This is all about the language ; and next to the language one has got to study atleast three or four subjects more — history, geography, economics, Psychology, arithmetic and also a little bit of Philosophy—all of which subjects are absolutely necessary for the development of the mind ; otherwise man would sink into the level of the birds and the beasts. You

must know the history and geography of your country otherwise you can not move about anywhere within your own native-land nor can you possibly have any dealings with your own countrymen if you are completely ignorant of their character or psychology. You have got to study a little bit of arithmetic and economics because without arithmetic how can you keep your accounts at home or in the office, wherever you may happen to be employed ; and without economics how can you make your budget of expenditure or how can you adjust your expenses to your income ? So, economics and arithmetic are equally necessary for our daily existence. So far Psychology is concerned, that too is a very important subject for your study because without some amount of knowledge of the human mind, how can you be sure whether you are dealing with an honest man or with a cheat in your daily dealings or transactions with the world at large in any sphere of life. If you do not know Psychology you will very often play the fool in the hands of every body and you may have to suffer a small or a great material loss in accordance with the degree of your knowledge or ignorance of Psychology.

2. Then comes the question of administration or legislation or government of your country. If you do not develop sufficient common-sense, sufficient power of analysis and judgment, sufficient sense of equity or justice, which you can develop by general education only, and not by scientific education at all, how can you rule your country as President or Prime Minister or as legislator or administrator in smaller capacities ; how can you maintain law and order in your country or how can you serve your country any way ? Don't you see how the illiterate section of your population, I mean, those who have not got even elementary general education, are being continually exploited by those others who have received some amount of general education whether upto the middle school or the high school standard ? There are many legislators and administrators in our country who are absolutely illiterate, and who are, therefore, mere dummies in the hands of their subordinates, who have received the requisite amount of general education.

3. General education gives a broad outlook on life because it is not a specialised knowledge of any particular

subject. By general education you become really human because the study of literature, philosophy, history, geography, psychology, and even politics and economics makes one feel at home in any sphere of human activity except in any scientific field. If one does not get any general education but on the other hand if he studies only science and knows only how to develop industries, he is actually dehumanised ; and that is exactly what he has become these days under the impact of scientific studies.

Third Speaker

Gentlemen, please consider just for a moment what general education has made of us during the last two hundred years ; it has made us only a race of clerks or *babus*, and we are even now-a-days not fit for any other trade or profession or occupation. Look at the thousands of graduates and postgraduates of our country who go in for general education;—ninety per cent of them are either clerks or school masters and what a life of wretchedness they live ! They cannot make even their both ends meet with the meagre wages which they earn by their petty job. Out of the remaining five percent of our population go in for law or medicine or administrative job; but how many can be good lawyers or physicians or how many of them can get into any of the Central Services to be magistrates or superior police officers or income tax officers or officers in the railways or in postal service or in the accounts department or else where ? During the British rule in India, our former rulers wanted to make us only clerks in order to carry on their administration or trade and commerce in our country ; and they never wanted us to be scientists or technicians or specialists in any particular field in order to earn a better living. That was the greatest cruelty which the Britishers did to us by imparting only general education and nothing of scientific or industrial or commercial education. After having seen the poisonous effect of general education upon our entire population do you still, gentlemen, want to advise your countrymen to go in for general education any more ? In my opinion, general education should be completely abolished or should be pushed into the background. I wonder sometimes why even after our independence we are allowing so many educational institutions—

colleges and universities—to produce nothing but a race of impotent graduates and post-graduates. I call them impotent because they are not capable of doing anything else but clerical or teaching work;—and we are thereby weakening our nation whereas other countries such as only Japan in the Far East and America, Russia, France, Germany, Britain—all are attaching the least importance to general education and the greatest importance to the study of sciences and industries. Why have we incurred such a heavy debt of millions of dollars or pounds or rupees in the development of our various projects because we have had no technical experts, not even sufficiently qualified mechanics in any field and consequently, we had to import many of them from various parts of the world on prohibiting terms. Can you imagine what the American or English or German or Russian engineers or technicians have charged us or are charging us even these days? Every one has been charging us fabulous terms, one tenth of which they could not possibly expect or demand from their own countries. That is the penalty we have paid so far for our general education. Would you still encourage general education any further in your country? I for myself would recommend an immediate abolition of general education.

Fourth Speaker

Gentlemen, do you mean to say that Russians and Americans have not already started regretting why they should have indulged in so much of scientific education? They must have discovered that general education has converted them into a race of brutes, that it has made their unemployment more acute, that it has created two distinct classes of people—the capitalists and the working class, who are at daggers drawn with each other. They know it for certain that the strife between the capitalists and the working-class will sooner or later bring about their complete ruin. It is science and industries alone which are the cause of the fall of man in the present century. Do you find any touch of humanity in the scientists or the industrialists? They can do the most heinous job for earning money only. The lust for wealth or power was completely unknown to the human world; it came with the advent of science, industries or rather with scientific education. But for a few wars at long intervals how happy were the various

countries which cultivated only art and literature and philosophy ! Those days of happiness and harmony have gone with the wind, and in their place, have come the days of rivalry, jealousy, competition, corruption, cruelty, exploitation and all sorts of moral degradation ! Would you like to bring such days to your country too—the days of poverty, want, penury, suffering, wretchedness and misery ? Well, I am not a candidate for seeing such sights particularly when my country is already over head and ears in all sorts of privations and difficulties. I would, therefore, strongly recommend the intensification of general education and scrapping of scientific education altogether.

RESULTS

First Speaker	secures	75	out of	100	marks
Second Speaker	„	75	„ „ „ „		
Third Speaker	„	60	„ „ „ „		
Fourth Speaker	„	45	„ „ „ „		

REVIEW

The topic for discussion is indeed a great problem of the present-day world, and hence, it requires a lot of deliberation to choose between general education and scientific education. But the success which has been achieved by three speakers out of four speakers in their discussion is indeed marvellous

BOARD'S OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Board is at a loss to say anything in the matter because the problem is so knotty that it is impossible to risk any suggestion, and that is why, it has all the more reason to congratulate some of the speakers upon their excellent performance.

In Print !

In Print !!

In Print !!!

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

(VOL. II)

By

Prof. T.K. Dutt, M A. (Cal. & Dac.)

It will pay you to increase your knowledge and enjoy the arguments advanced by various Speakers in the Group Discussions of Volume II : —

1. Should crime stories and detective films be banned ?
2. Do you think, the past was better or the present is better.
3. Who tempts whom first—is it man who tempts woman first or is it woman who tempts man first ?
4. Is materialism or spiritualism the best philosophy of life ?
5. Is suicide an act of courage or cowardice ?
6. Reading or travelling—which is the better source of knowledge ?
7. Can Strikes or Lock-outs settle labour and employment disputes ?
8. Should students take part in politics or not ?
9. Should man and woman receive the same kind of Education ?
10. Should we ban cow slaughter or not in our country ?
11. Is honesty the best policy ?
12. Do you think, Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war ?

13. Is celibacy or marriage desirable ?
14. Who is the better politician—Gandhi or Nehru ?
15. Would you like to remain on earth or fly to the moon ?
16. Should religion be abolished, and why ?
17. Which would you prefer—Democracy or Dictatorship,—and why ?
18. Is boxing or wrestling a civilized pastime ?
19. Should the freedom of the Press be curtailed to help the function of Democracy ?
20. Do you think that for Defence services mere physical fitness or interview are sufficient ?
21. Should the written test be abolished ?
22. Between development of industries and development of agriculture, which would you prefer for your own country ?
23. Do you think, foreign aid of any kind is a curse or a blessing to India ?
24. Something is wrong with the present system of our education and not with the students or the teachers.
25. Is the Purdah system beneficial to Indian home life ?
26. How far is it true to say that the legal profession is a trade of lies and falsehood ?
27. Untouchability is perfectly justified by the law of distribution of labour.
28. How far India is a Welfare State ?
29. Is India the heavily-taxed country ?
30. How to hold the price-line in India ?
31. How is our Government carrying out its State Socialist policies ?
32. How best to eradicate corruption in Services ?
33. The Tashkent Declaration is a testament comparable to the Bandung declaration. Do you agree ?
34. Should India quit the Commonwealth ?
35. Should India become a nuclear Power ?

- 36 Have the Five-Years-Plans improved the economic welfare of our people ?
37. Can the liberalised import policy spell danger to the independence of the nation ?
- 38 How far the attitude of our Government on the West Asian or Middle East crisis been helpful to the Arab nations.
39. How do birth control and family planning solve the population control in India ?
40. Is Cinema likely to ruin the character of our students ?
- 41 How far "Co-existence" is mankind's hopeful channel ?
42. Should India manufacture "atom-bomb" ?
43. Has the British Empire been liquidated ?
44. Is the Tashkent spirit, on the non-use of "force", tantamount to Gandhian ideal of non-violence ?
- 45 Has Religion to be lived, not learned as a creed ?
46. Would the world be safer without politicians ?
47. Is "life" a bed of roses ?
- 48 Is character greater than all things of life ?
49. How far Arab nations are justified in wiping out the very existence of Israel ?
50. How far the principles of peace, justice and equality are best enshrined in the Indian Constitution ?
51. Is the problem of "closure" of Suez Canal a political issue ?
52. Does Britain everywhere follow the policy of 'divide and rule' ?—in Asia, Africa, India as well as in Europe ?
53. Is the shadow of Britain all over the world ?
54. Has the Tashkent spirit failed ?
55. How has the progressive Arab nationalism led to much embarrassment ?
56. Is it practicable ?—the formation of a pan-Islamic block embracing the regions from Pakistan to Turkey ?

57. Are students the successful administrators, politicians and legislators of tomorrow ?
58. What should be the role of modern youths towards social India ?
59. Who is greater—Shakespeare or Kalidas ?
60. Discipline is life and life is discipline. Do you agree ?
61. Is everyman the maker of his destiny ?
62. How far education is preparation for life ?
63. Is the future of democracy gloomy in India ?
64. Can democracy solve the problem of economic inequality and exploitation ?
65. How to create 'moral society' in India ?
66. Who is more serviceable—a poet, a lawyer or a legislator ?
67. How far is U.S.A justified in Vietnam ?
68. Who is more useful—the teacher or the doctor ?
69. Is life better for us than it was for our fore-fathers ?
70. Are poets the best legislators of the world ?
71. Will Secularism survive ?
72. Is China poised on our frontiers for any territorial gain ?
73. How best to cultivate democracy in India ?
74. What steps would you suggest to check food smuggling ?
75. How to increase tourist traffic in India ?
76. What should be the aim of a modern woman—a marriage (family-life) or a career ?
77. What are good manners ?
78. Who is a learned ?
79. How to improve the living conditions of Harijans ?
80. What are the dangers to our freedom ?
81. What is Pakistan's attitude towards India—Is it co-operative or hostile ?
82. How to solve India's economic ills ?

83. What should be the peaceful solution to the West-Asian crisis ?
84. Is it right for a partyman to cross the floor of the House ?
85. Should literature reflect the spirit of the times ?
86. Are "Gheraoes" anti-Gandhian or in the spirit of Gandhian Satyagraha ?
87. Why are there race-riots in western hemisphere ?
88. Should prohibition be liberalised ?
89. Will Mao's policies survive ?
90. Should wage-freeze be introduced ?

PRICE ... Rs. 30

Postage Extra.

Availale from :—

STUDENTS' ACADEMIC COUNCIL

1882, Baldev Nagar, Ambala City (Haryana)

GROUP-DISCUSSIONS

(VOL. III)

It covers another 45 discussions likely to be raised in I.A.S. & S.S. Board interviews. Hence every School and College library must stock it for the benefit of their students.

Price : Rs. 25.00

Student' Academic Council

1882, Baldev Nagar, Ambala City (Haryana)

For Competitive Candidates :

Encyclopaedia

OF

SUCCESSFUL INTERVIEWS

Read the Technique of Interviews by an I.A.S. & P.C.S. qualified man; Actual Scripts of I.P.S. & Central Service Interviews; Group Discussions; Actual Word for word scripts of I.A.S. Interviews given by Successful Candidates; Actual Joint Services Wing Interviews; Actual Punjab Civil Service interviews; Railway Service Interviews. Actual Scripts given. A lot of information; hence a Unique and Useful publication.

Price Rs. 4.00

Postage Re. 1

More Actual Successful Interviews

by

KRISHNA CHOUDHARY, B. A.



It is a collection of Actual Successful Interviews given by I.A.S.; I.M.A. P.C.S. candidates. It deserves perusal for Success in Viva Voce by prospective competitors.

Price.

Rs. 4 00

Postage

Rs. 1.00

Please Order direct from

Students Academic Council

**1882, Baldev Nagar,
AMBALA CITY.**

